

PROPHECY AND PHILOSOPHY

VOLUME I

ELIJAH ISAIAH HEIDDEGAR

By Dr. Montchesney Riddle Gottfredson

1977

PROPHECY AND PHILOSOPHY	1
ELIJAH ISAIAH HEIDDEGAR	1
By Dr. Montchesney Riddle Gottfredson	1
1977	1
PREFACE	6
PART I Meanings and Significance In Personal Existence	8
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	9
Objectivity In Existence	9
The World	9
Culture	9
Creation	10
Miracle	10
Prophecy	11
Man	11
God	12
Subjectivity In Existence	12
The World	12
Culture	13
Creation	13
Miracle	14
Prophecy	14
Man	15
God	15
CHAPTER 2 – TRANSCENDENCE AND ‘BEING-IN’	16
Transcending-Subjectivity-Objectivity In Existence	16
The World	16
Culture	16
Creation	17
Miracle	18
Prophecy	18
Man	19
God	19
Personal-Being- In -One-Another	20
Essence In Existence	22
Speculation and Phenomenology	22
Significance and Freedom	23
A Myth of Painters	23
The Meaning of God-in-the-World	24
Response In Personal Existence	25

taking divine and personal existence to be present-at-hand. In this circumstance, we may not appropriately and should not attempt to make for ourselves a God either by cunning or common senses. We may not appropriately and should not accommodate ourselves simply by calling on an accustomed God.

What we may do appropriately in this circumstance is, modestly and without fear of Godlessness, to remain near and be-in the Serene Reserved in our own personal existence in each other in care in such a way that, by observing more delicately and critically the divine creative dimension in our own personal existence, we may possibly be-in-creation more and more meaningfully and significantly, and so metalogically better understand the prophetic theology of the divine-creation-creating-creator. But we may not adequately remain near and be-in the divine Serene Reserved creativity without being-in and near our own creativity since we ourselves are the closest encounter possible to divine creativity in being-in-divine-creativity personally. So, when we flee from ourselves as to who we ourselves essentially are in our own creativity in our own self-subsistent care, we are fleeing our possibilities of understanding something of the divine creative dimension in personal existence.

Being-in-one s-creation-personally in one s own self-subsistent-care is one s own possibility of being-in-divine-creation personally. Otherwise there is no personal creation but only the producing of something contingently-present-at-hand from which it is impossible to create something existing personally. From a metalogical prophetic perspective, the most that can be adequately said in modesty here is that men are in-divine-creation; they are created and creating and exist to the extent that they are seeing and hearing and speaking. Necessary conditions of men s seeing and hearing and speaking are transcending response and self-perception in personal existence. A necessary condition of response and self-perception in personal existence is personal self-subsistence in one s own care. In the destiny of one s own personal self-subsistence in his own care, he may possibly know and become more and more who he essentially is in his own creation and creating in his own care in one another. Only then are freedom and responsibility and peace and joy and justice possible in the personal participation in the divine creation and creating and revealing of who I myself am in my own way of being myself essentially in myself and others in our own care.

himself essentially. In his care, he is essentially resolute. As an issue in and for and to himself in his care, he is essentially open and bright and clear in and for and to himself and others as to who he himself essentially is. In their care, it is possible for persons to have personal attitudes and be in personal situations of willing and wishing, urge and addiction, concern and solicitude, circumspective deliberation, the call of conscience, the possibility of being-guilty, resolute anticipation of ends, understanding, states of mind (moods), and discourse with each other. Care is one's own essential ways of being himself personally. In one's own care is the constancy of one's own essential ways of being himself in his personal community. In his personal constancy in his care, a person has his own stewardships and responsibilities and callings and joys and salvations.

In one's own care, he is personally self-subsistent and so is able to start from himself as an essentially non-contingent person in an investigation of the meanings in and significance of his own personal existence. Whenever one finds himself in his own personal existence, for example, he is always in some state of mind (mood) or other in his own care. Even though one's moods and experiences may seem only to be fleeting or cumulative or changing experiences contingent to a simple past, in their *constant* changing and accumulating they are able to be maintained throughout with some sort of selfsameness in one's own personal care.

The certain possibility that persons *transcend* themselves personally while at the same time (ecstatically) being-in themselves essentially in their own ways of being themselves essentially is possible (and is grounded in) in persons being-in themselves and each other *transcendently* in their own care. This personal being-in each other is possible as a nonsubstantial and noncontingent and non-present-at-hand being-in one's own care in each other personally and makes creation and annihilation in personal existence (*transcendently*) possible. Persons *are* in creation in one another in their own care in the existentiality of their own ways of being themselves essentially, and as such they are creating and annihilating themselves and each other in their own ways of being themselves essentially.

At the same time (ecstatically), one's own personal existence *is* essentially an embodiment in one's own personal existence in and for and of one's own ways of being himself essentially in his own care in being an issue in and for and to and of himself. As such, he himself is himself essentially a revelation in and of and for and to himself and others as to who he himself essentially is in his own care in his own ways of being himself essentially.

And all of this is possible since persons in their own care are always already constantly ahead-of-themselves-and-behind-themselves-in-themselves-and-each-other ecstatically.

In their own care, persons are essentially responsible and free and valuable, but not in the sense of being contingently-present-at-hand. Freedom and responsibility means personal participation in the revealing and letting-be of whatever (whoever) essentially is as such in his own ways of being himself essentially. Personal existence is fulfilled in one's own responsibility and freedom and value. Freedom and responsibility are not what common sense is content to let pass under these names, i.e., the random and fleeting and chance ability to do as we please. In existing in the destiny of their own self-subsistent care personally, persons are in the more certain possibility of finding and so creating and becoming, who they themselves essentially are in their own ways of being themselves essentially in each other in their own care.

In the confusion of an era of a loss of the divine dimension in the sense of the death of the practical-everyday God(s) and the Logos God(s), the affirmation of the creative possibilities of persons becoming themselves in their own essential ways of being themselves in themselves and each other in their own self-subsistent care appears to be idolatrous and atheistic. What one overlooks in so concluding are the modest possibilities of envisioning more meaningful and significant divine dimensions in personal creative freedom and responsibility than those projected in the projecting of personal existence as created as contingent to God with its implicit projection of personal existence as present-at-hand. When the creation of man by God is so conceived, it is a confusion between a creation and a producing (manufacturing) of man, and as such does not reach the divine dimension of his authentic being-in-creation personally in his own care.

Understanding that it is impossible for man to know all that God is, metaphysical prophecy nevertheless begins modestly to understand that the traditional proclamations of preclassical, classical, and logical prophecy against idolatry and atheism are too immodest and too simple. It sees a significant correlation between the death of God and the spiritual annihilation of man. The death of God and the annihilation of man are correlates of the same phenomena in human existence, viz., persons being lost in falling from themselves as to who they essentially are in the creativity of being themselves essentially in their own care, including every form of

Self-Perception In Personal Existence	25
Potential and Not-ness in Existence	26
Being-In Truth and Value	27
PART II The Prophecy of Elijah, Isaiah, and Heidegger	29
CHAPTER 3 – INTRODUCTION	30
CHAPTER 4 – ELIJAH	32
Prophetic Theology	32
Prophetic Anthropology	33
Prophetic Sociology	34
Prophetic Epistemology and Revelation	34
Prophetic Ontology	35
CHAPTER 5 – ISAIAH	36
Prophetic Theology	36
Prophetic Anthropology	40
Prophetic Sociology	44
Prophetic Epistemology	54
The Dissipation of Idols	56
Nearness and Divine Presence	56
Nearness and the Spirit of Inquiry	57
Stillness, Attention, Listening, and Sensitivity	57
Harmony, Rhythm, Voice, Song, and Sensitivity	57
Prophetic Ontology	59
CHAPTER 6 – POST-CLASSICAL HEIDEGGERIAN AND	
Prophetic Theology	66
PROPHETIC ANTHROPOLOGY	67
PROPHETIC SOCIOLOGY	68
PROPHETIC EPISTEMOLOGY	71
PROPHETIC ONTOLOGY	75
CHAPTER 7 – HEIDEGGERIAN AND POST-HEIDEGGERIAN PROPHETIC	
Tracing the Historicity of Traditional Ontology	77
PRESENT-AT-HAND AND EXISTENTIAL SPACE AND TIME	80
ONTOLOGIES OF NOTHINGNESS	82
PERSONAL EXISTENTIAL BEING-THERE (DASEIN)	85
TEMPORALITY IN THE CONSTANT-SELF-SUBSISTENCE OF PERSONAL EXISTENCE	87
BEING-IN AND BEING-TOWARD DEATH AND BIRTH	89
DEATH	89
BIRTH	91
PART III THE CREATION AND ANNIHILATION OF MAN	93
CHAPTER 8 – PROPHETIC ONTOLOGY	94
Ontology	95

The Ecstatic Temporality of Creation and Annihilation	95
Contingency and the Personal-Being-There in Creation and Annihilation	96
Contingency and Being-In Personal Creation and Annihilation	97
Contingent Being-There and Not-Being in Creation and Annihilation	100
Possibilities and Freedom in Personal Creation and Annihilation	101
Being-In Creation and Annihilation in One's Own Care	102
Being Lost and Found in One's Own Creation and Annihilation	102
CHAPTER 9 – PROPHETIC ANTHROPOLOGY	104
CHAPTER 10 – PROPHETIC SOCIOLOGY	108
CHAPTER 11 – PROPHETIC THEOLOGY	113
CHAPTER 12 – PROPHETIC EPISTEMOLOGY	120
PART IV – SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	124
CHAPTER 13 – SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	125

present-at-hand events. The ontological structure of the personal entity who in each case I myself am centers in the self-subsistent being-here (*Dasein*) of my own personal existence in my own care. A person's unity and totality in his personal ecstatic temporality in his care means that as existing he is constantly ahead-of-himself-and-behind-himself-already-being-in-himself-as being alongside and in others and entities-in-a-world, i.e., whenever he exists he is always already having been and being-here and becoming in the sense of I-am-personally-having-been-myself as well as *being-here* as *and-becoming-myself* essentially. These items of care have not been and are not being and will not be pieced together cumulatively so that personal existence is something that has been or is being or will be put together in the course of time. The essential ecstatic temporality in personal existence is one's primordial personal being-outside-of-himself-in-and-for himself. The ontological basis of this personal temporality and every other essential aspect in and of personal existence is persons always essentially coming back and forth to and from themselves personally as to who they themselves are in their own essential ways of being themselves in themselves and others, even though this possibility may be lost from time to time.

Only in so understanding his temporality ecstatically does a person adequately see that he himself is the possibility of comporting himself toward himself, including his birth and death as his own personal possibilities in his own care. When his heritage is thus handed down to himself, his birth and death are caught up into his existence in coming to his own essential possibilities in his own existence personally.

Then what is the essential difference between a contingent being-there and the personal self-subsistent being-here (*Dasein*) in the ecstatic temporality of one's own ways of being himself essentially in his own care in his own personal existence? A contingent being-there (*Dasein*) is a present-at-hand was brought into being and was placed there. The *essential* Reality of that which is contingent is other than and outside of itself so that any contingent Reality is *essentially* dependent upon that to which it is contingent in such a way that its *essential* being-there is *essentially* contingent. In and of itself, it is not *essentially* really Real. The essentially responsible in and of and for himself and others and free in and of and for himself and others reality, then, is not an *essentially* contingent Reality but is a personally self-subsistent reality. Whenever persons find themselves as to who they themselves essentially are, they find themselves to be and manifest themselves to be essentially their own possibilities in their own care in one another.

This personal being-possible is to be sharply distinguished both from logical (present-at-hand) possibilities and from the contingent possibilities of something present-at-hand since they are found to be possibilities, whereas in personal existence a person finds and so understands in one way or another his own possibilities as grounded in his own being possibility in his own care. When, then, one comports himself toward himself whether implicitly in one way or another or not in such a way that he takes his existence to be essentially present-at-hand as contingent to a present-at-hand birth and death, what he presumes that he turns out to be is essentially nothing except as he may be-there (*Dasein*) as contingent to something (someone) through whom (somehow) his Reality is (somehow) brought into being and is thereby secured (saved). But this securing of his Being Real as a contingent-present-at-hand-Real -Being there is an inauthentic security in which his personal existence is not really his own (is spiritually annihilated). What one is doing in this supposedly secure movement toward contingency is fleeing from himself. When one flees from himself in the confusion of his lost anxiety toward and fear of being nothing at all Really in being-himself essentially, and flees toward the security of being something Really as being-contingent-to some Real Reality (someone), this fleeing is an inauthentic creating (spiritual annihilation) of his really being himself essentially.

In spite of the almost overwhelming human tendency for persons to take their existence to be contingently-present-at-hand on the basis of a present-at-hand-contingency which one certainly sees at birth and death, one's own personal existence turns out to be a manifestation of an essentially personal self-subsistent existence whose characteristics particularly of essential responsibility and freedom certify it to be personally self-subsistent in its possibilities as certainly one's own in one's own care. But how are we to understand care as the most basic existential in which persons are in their own ways of being themselves essentially?

Care is not something that can be defined nor systematically elucidated nor elaborated nor described, nor can it be pointed to by way of a demonstration. One can, however, speak about clues as to what (who) it is and so get some understanding of it. In a person's care, his own most potentiality for being himself essentially is an issue for and in and of and to himself. His finding himself in being-free for his ownmost possibilities is accomplished in his care. He is his ownmost possibilities in his own care. In his care, he determines who he specifically is in his own ways of being

essences whose distinguishing characteristics are being-present-at-hand. That which is present-at-hand answers to the question of what-it-is, i.e., what is Reality in and of itself? In metalogical prophetic-philosophizing, essences are in personal existence and are envisioned as existential, i.e., are personal ways of being oneself essentially in one's own ways of being himself essentially in his own *care* in one another and answer to the question of who he is.

Here four prophetic-philosophizing keys open up ways of seeing through the presumed paradoxes facing the quest of envisioning ontologically who persons essentially are in their own personal existence.

The essence of who persons essentially are is in personal existence itself, and is always so manifest ontologically. And in personal existence itself is an essentially ecstatic temporality and spatiality. And personal existence is equiprimordially (grounded in) one's own existence in one's own care, in which we encounter everyday circumspective concern.

Whereas in classical Idealism an essence philosophy has to be demonstrated rationally (logically), metalogical prophetic-philosophizing *envisions* ontologically the essence of personal existence as care phenomenologically. Envisioning (in-visioning) is seeing more and more the meanings in and significance of the essential personal phenomena being-manifest in personal existence through and in personal existence itself in living in one's own existence in each other personally. These unveilings occur in proportion to the extent that persons become and are enabled to be sensitive to the essentially personal rhythms and tunes and creative ways of being themselves essentially that they are and are in and so find themselves as to who they themselves essentially are. This envisioning is possible since personal existence reveals itself to be essentially there (*Dasein*) in being really here in its own self-subsistent care in its own spatiality and temporality ecstatically. This personal possibility of being oneself essentially in oneself and others in their own ways of being themselves essentially is a certain possibility in being ecstatically self-subsistent in one's own care.

This phenomenological envisioning of the essence of personal existence sees through the limitations of Idealism and Realism and practical-everyday views (and even preliminary existentialism when not carrying through a personal ontology) in envisioning meaning and significance in personal existence itself. In being-lost in the idle talk and curiosity and ambiguity and metaphysics of being fallen from themselves into these worlds, persons take themselves to be contingent as present-at-hand to God and the cosmos or to Ideal absolutes external to themselves. In so doing, they mis-takenly flee from themselves as to who they themselves essentially are to their presumably secure contingency to these absolutes and so mis-understand and overlook the meanings in and significance of their own personal existence. This mis-taking leads persons to comport themselves toward their own existence and creation and annihilation as though it and they also were (are) contingently-present-at-hand. What this turns out to be is a spiritual annihilation of who they themselves really are in their own care. In this confusion, persons attempt to find themselves by tracing their existence to the creation of a simple past contingently-present-at-hand birth and their annihilation to a simple future contingently-present-at-hand death.

Without the presently impossible *necessity* of *first* having to understand (absolutely-totally) what birth and death are (were will be), metalogical prophetic-philosophizing envisions the modest possibility of seeing something of real meanings in and the significance of personal existence on the basis of seeing something of who persons are in their own essential ways of being themselves essentially. This prophetic-philosophical envisioning is possible since a person is a self-subsistent-embodiment of one's own care in which one's own personal existence is essentially his own possibility of being himself essentially. Since one's own personal existence in and for and of one's own ways of being himself essentially is in his own care, he himself is himself essentially a revelation in and of and for and to himself and others as to who he himself really is.

But persons themselves being the self-subsistent embodiment of their own revelation of who they themselves essentially are is proximally and for the most part lost and so denied since the most natural way of comporting themselves toward themselves is to take the meaning and significance of their creation (birth) and existence (life) and annihilation (death) to be obviously understood as what they see them (obviously) to be, i.e., contingently-present-at-hand.

But when one envisions care-fully the ecstatic temporality in personal existence, he sees that what appears to be an obviously adequate understanding of the creation and annihilation and existence of persons as contingently-present-at-hand on the basis of a present-at-hand birth and death does not adequately account for one's being-in his own personal temporality ecstatically. Personal existential temporality is essentially ecstatic from which is-derived the everyday and by analogy the metaphysical sensation of time as only a continuous succession of past, present, and future

PREFACE

The context for the point of departure of this work is known as existentialism, though each of the major figures considered to be involved in the initiation and carrying-out of movements which have been so classified actually relate to a so-called movement of existentialism in ways so complex and varied that it is misleading to think of anything approaching a monolithic development of existentialism where they are involved. One thoroughly involved with the work of Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Marcel, Heidegger, Jaspers, Sartre, and Buber will see the present work saturated with strains of thought from each. An initial impression might then consider this work to be existentialist. A careful consideration will show, however, that it is full of the influence of these men, at the same time it represents almost a radical departure from each, and in some sense from what is often considered some general facets of the moods of existentialism. Its personalism, essential-existential correlations and transcendences, its Christianity, and its ontological-metaphysical correlations and transcendences represent in its total orientation a significantly different view of the above mentioned work, and even all taken together, even though the context of the point of departure may be said to be roughly the same, at least in significant strains of thought.

There are no footnotes in the essay. It is presented in such a way that the influence of existentialists on the work cannot be so specifically identified adequately. Any attempt would necessarily involve a proliferation of footnotes of single words and short phrases rather than quotations, and these words and phrases are already well known and easily identified. Being-in is Heideggerian, life is Nietzschean, presence is Buberian and Marcelian, whole is Heideggerian and Jasperian, etc. The work then represents my own way of profiting from, but not subscribing too closely to, the developments of existentialism in deciding how best to conceive meaning and significance in personal existence.

In a certain sense, this work is admittedly awkward, though less so the further into it one reads. It is awkward for several reasons. That which it is attempting to show is not best (and perhaps not at all) seen through either an empirical or a metaphysical (logical) demonstration. It is meta-empirical and meta-logical. It is only to be hinted at and somehow and somewhere and somewhen more or less envisioned as a prophetic-philosophizing. That which it is attempting to show is something of the essence of meanings and significance in personal existence and is an awkward subject and cannot be directly demonstrated since personal existence is an issue in and of and to and for itself. In a sense, then, the subject is hidden in the words of the book.

And so that which it is attempting to show does not lend itself well either to practical-everyday or metaphysical discourse. It is written kind of in the spirit, though not the style of Marcel's, Nietzsche's and Kierkegaard's works in which its salient points are talked about in various ways. One is liable to get the impression at first that it is something we have heard before and already know about, though one may feel in reading on that it never quite gets precisely to the point in a way which is eminently clear and demonstrably so and well put so that it may be well understood by all, yet if one gets a feel for that which it is about it may be somewhat meaningful and significant for him. In other words, its essential communicability turns out to be indirect and subtle though at first it does not appear to be.

Its mode of presentation is meta-logical phenomenology. It is a (descriptive) envisioning of (in) that which appears in personal existence as essentially meaningful and significant. This mode of presentation will likely be disconcerting to one accustomed to logical-metaphysical philosophical presentations as well as to one accustomed to straightforward practical-everyday literature. Hopefully, one can adjust to the prophetic-philosophizing meta-logical mode of its presentation in its making points (in a sort of Heideggerian phenomenological way) that have not yet been and perhaps cannot be adequately, logically demonstrated, though they are stated as if they had been and so transcend these discomforts and annoyances and so see some value in it.

This book is entered into with the purpose of presenting a picture which in a certain sense is of a very specific kind but is nevertheless in another sense and at the same time a general one. Its specificity involves a certain kind of radical departure from tradition, but yet it attempts to show a general picture in which no point is elaborated in such detail that no further discussion is advisable.

In a certain sense, the mode of the book is Nietzschean; that is, each theme is likely to be misunderstood unless one follows it and its modifications carefully throughout. That which the book is about is best seen as a whole in which several strands are intermingled in various ways.

CHAPTER 13 – Summary and Conclusions

There are significant indications that in the twentieth century a new era is dawning in human history. It is a metalogical (transcending-metaeros-metalogos) care-ful era. In this care-ful era, the possibilities are dawning of meaningful ontologies of (in) personal existence.

Proximally and for the most part, men are and have been lost to who they themselves are; that is, they have lost who they themselves essentially are. In being-lost, they are fallen from themselves into worlds in which who they themselves essentially are is mis-taken.

In the practical-everyday world in which men live, there is much confusion between who persons themselves essentially are and the public world of the they. In being fallen from themselves into the they, persons comport themselves toward themselves on the basis of the generalizations of the they. This being-lost is characterized by idle talk, everyday curiosity, and ambiguity. In the idle talk of the everydayness of being-lost and scattered in the they, the essential nature of and one's authentic-being-toward-persons-personally is not imparted. When persons maintain themselves in idle talk, they are cut off from their primary and primordially genuine relationships with and in and to and for themselves and others. In everyday curiosity, persons concern themselves with seeing, not really in order to understand especially the essential nature of what is seen, but just in order to see. It is characterized by not tarrying alongside and in what is really closest in personal existence and by not being primordially observant of who persons essentially are. Proximally and for the most part, it seems to men that their practical-everyday conceptions of the nature of their personal existence are most adequate and authentic, especially since they are quite obviously based upon that (even though changing) Reality which is closest to them. Practical (and Divinely revealed) public laws, for example, are deemed sufficient for creating justice if only men would live them.

From time to time, however, philosophizing perceives limitations in conceiving Reality to be grounded essentially in the changing decay and therefore corruptibility of the everyday world and so transcend it metaphysically to discover Reality as it is in itself. Hellenistic philosophical (and Christian) Idealism, for example, sees the annihilation of social justice in the ethical relativism consequent to failure to discover the absolute Ideal forms of justice external to human existence upon which true justice must be grounded. Justice is created by rationally (logically) discovering the harmony inherent in absolute justice and then (somehow) bringing persons individually and socially into conformity with it. What this philosophical Idealism does is to absolutize truth into a realm by itself to which men must (somehow) conform if they are to progress epistemologically (and ethically) in coming to the truth (of justice).

Preliminary stages in the dawning existential era in human history saw (sees) the question of essence to be a crucial point of consideration in human history. In practical-everyday, including preclassical prophetic, considerations of the meaning and significance of human existence, there is no basic concern over the essence of human history and personal existence. The logical stage of the preexistential era has a deep concern over the question of essence and affirms that Reality is essential. In other words, absolute Reality, Being, and Truth exist in an absolute, timeless, static (changeless) realm (a realm of the essence of all things) from which everyday Reality (somehow) emanates. A post-practical, postlogical, preexistential Realism denies the existence of an absolute realm of essential Reality, Being, and Truth, and affirms objective Reality as the only Reality. In the midst of the question of essence, the preliminary stages in the dawning existential era developed two main forms of thought regarding the question. Both saw (see) the question of the nature of personal existence (*Dasein*) to be crucial to the question of essence (Being). One form as it supposed(es) denied the existence of an absolute realm of Truth and Reality by itself but affirmed the possibility of uncovering what Being (essence) is through the being of *Dasein* (human existence), which, though repeatedly denied, amounts to the same thing as affirming an absolute realm by itself. The other form in effect denied (personal) essence altogether in affirming that (personal human) existence precedes (any) essence.

None of these practical-everyday and philosophizing inquiries, however, had (have) specifically envisioned (possibilities of ontologies of) personal existence ontologically. Metalogical prophetic-philosophizing, as a secondary stage in the dawning existential era in human history, envisions (certain) essential personal possibilities ontologically (essentially) in personal existence. Essence here, however, is not to be confused with either the substance (essence) philosophizing of classical Idealism or Realism or the premetalogical stages of existential philosophizing. Implicit in each of these substance philosophies usually inadvertently whether affirming or denying essence, are

PART IV – Summary and Conclusions

PART I – Meanings and Significance 'In' Personal Existence

CHAPTER 1 – Introduction

Objectivity ‘In’ Existence

The World

It is usual to suppose that the first impression or the general impression or the objective view persons have of the world is always adequate or the most real. Men presume automatically to see the world directly and immediately. The world is considered to be objectively common to all. The rise of epistemology in the West has shown, however, that these views of the world are technically inadequate though the exact nature of these inadequacies are not clarified, nor even generally agreed upon. Still, the nature of the perception/conception of causation, world, things-as-they-are-in-themselves, meaning and significance, life, etc., remain technically problematical. Descartes, Hume, and Kant have made extensive contributions to the uncovering of the subjective dimensions of perception/conception/consciousness. In Jaspers, Marcel, Heidegger, and Sartre are indications that the problem is one of transcending the subjective-objective dichotomy though the exact nature of this transcendence remains unclarified. Subjective philosophy and, subsequently, existentialism have not yet dealt comprehensively enough with the problems of objectivity to make their efforts adequate for modern Christian philosophy.

Culture

It is usual to suppose that meaning and significance are objective phenomena. This illusion is one of seeing and hearing ; that is, that our usual processes of seeing and hearing objectively give us meaning and significance. Objectivity is the illusion that all observers always see and hear in common the same. It originates in its practicability and usefulness in the general pursuits of life in maintaining a subsistence. The manipulation of tools, weapons, and instruments that is, objects is accompanied by the impression that everyone is seeing, hearing, and doing essentially the same things. This impression is accompanied by the conclusion that everyone is being the same.

This view of the world begins to break down as culture begins to increase; that is, when the manifestations of life are no longer limited to the maintenance of a bare subsistence or its close approximation. Culture is the increased and increasing manifestations of meaning in life beyond life as bare subsistence. When life is no longer thus limited through a surplus of goods and services and the consequent condition of leisure culture begins to arise and complexify. This complexification of life shows, for example in its art forms, that objectivity is an illusion, i.e., that all observers do not always see and hear in common the same, and consequently that all persons are not essentially the same. The meaning of life, then, is not the same for everyone.

The discovery that objectivity is illusory produces curiosity, surprise, anguish, distrust, disgust, debate, war, strife, suspicion, hatred, contempt, concern, apathy, striving, convincing, argumentation, etc. These events are accompanied by ever-greater possibilities and dimensions of seeing and hearing and speaking ; that is, of creating and envisioning the meaning and significance of life.

Creation

It is usual to presume that creation is an objective phenomenon, viz., that it is essentially constituted in the making of tools, weapons, instruments, substances that is, objects and is accompanied by the impression that the maker of objects is therefore a creator.

This illusion arises in its practicability and usefulness in the general objective pursuits of life in maintaining a subsistence. The continual making of a tool or weapon suggests to the manufacturer that he is thereby creating it. These events often involve the development of the notion that creation is *ex nihilo* out of nothing. This notion develops from the objective observation that where there was objectively no sword or hoe prior to one's manipulations, one now exists . Just as objective creation is an illusion, so also is creation *ex nihilo*. Traditional Christian dogmas of creation are in a perpetual state of confusion, for example, with regard to distinguishing between objective manipulation and creation, and also between objectively making *ex nihilo* and creation. Indicating this confusion is the typical dogma that the Bible shows us the entire man as the work of the

the ex-expression of his im-pressions is-are always characteristically his in his being an issue in and for and to and of himself, and is always so identifiable (without overt signature) by mature observation . This twoness , however, is not an Ideal-Real or subject-object or transcendent-imminent dualism of some thing contingent to something else as present-at-hand. It is an ex-expression of who a person essentially is in the multi dimensional unity of his own ways of being himself essentially.

A person's creative artistry may be spoken about and may be seen and heard and responded to in various epistemological ways, some authentic and some inauthentic. Who persons essentially are in the creativity of their own ways of being themselves essentially in each other personally in their own care may be epistemologically lost and found . One cannot adequately and authentically know who persons essentially are in their own personal creation and creativity and creating on the basis of the practical-everyday epistemology of solving objective problems or the metaphysical epistemology of solving metaphysical problems by a subject knowing a subject or an object by knowing the truth (as an emanation or reflection of an Ideal form), notwithstanding the success of these techniques in solving practical and metaphysical problems.

Being-in the truth of one's own creation and creativity and creating in one's own care is being-in-creative-truths personally. These are personal ways of being which are primordially true . The essential character of being-in creative truth personally is existential; that is, it is persons own ways of creatively being themselves essentially in one another in their existence. In this being-in the truth of their own creation, persons own ways of being themselves in each other are not essentially comparable with one another and entities in a truth-relationality and in a value hierarchy in which the creation and creativity and creating in one's own ways of being himself essentially are more (or less) valuable or more (or less) true than others and can be known as such.

Knowing who persons essentially are in their own personal creation and creativity and creating is persons mature being-in-one-another creatively in being-in one another's rhythms and tunes (styles) attunefully (in-tune) in being themselves essentially in such a way that they envision and respond to their styles in one another essentially. In the maturity of these ex-expressed im-pressions, each person's own creative ways of being himself essentially are always here , and so may possibly be authentically identified and appreciated as such.

what their creation is. This fleeing from themselves to come to know what their creation is is an evasion which conceals; conceals from himself who one essentially is in the creation and annihilation of his own ways of being himself essentially.

So there is confusion between an epistemology of the creation of man and an epistemology in the creation of man. This epistemology in the creation of man is an epistemological creativity in personal existence. In other words, in this confusion what one overlooks is that who one is essentially in his own ways of being himself essentially in his own care creates his own understanding of who he himself is, and at the same time (ecstatically) his understanding of who he himself is is creating who he essentially is as being-in his own creation of himself as to who he himself essentially is.

But if persons are essentially themselves in the ecstatic self-subsistent creation of who they themselves are, and so are able to know who they themselves are as being their own revelation of their own creation in being-in their own creation, why is it that persons are or can be lost and so seldom observe that they themselves are their own revelation of their own creation and creativity? This question arises out of the continual confusion of personal existence with whatever is present-at-hand as contingent. What is contingently-present-at-hand is either there as to what it essentially is, or is lost, and when lost is at least amenable to being traced to that present-at-hand event in space and time to which it is contingent that caused it to be lost. Personal existence, however, is such that, as an issue for and in itself in one's own care, a person may at the same time (ecstatically) be himself essentially in his own ways of being himself in his creation creativity and yet be lost to himself in such a way that he neither understands who he himself essentially is nor knows what his creation and creativity are.

So in existing in the destiny of their own self-subsistent care personally, persons in their own due time (ecstatically) may possibly come to envision their own personal possibilities in being-in-their-own creation personally of being themselves essentially in their own ways of being themselves essentially. By being-in our own personal existence in each other in care in such a way that by observing more delicately and critically the divine creative dimension in our own personal existence, we may possibly be-in-our-own-creation-and-creativity more and more meaningfully and significantly and so metalogically better understand our creation and creativity.

Knowing our own self-subsistent creative destiny is disclosed in the self-perception of personal existence, which is disclosed in care in the voice of conscience. The voice of conscience as a way of knowing one's creative destiny here refers primordially to the existential foundations of personal existence more than to practical-everyday and logical epistemology. In this voice, one does not primarily find or know or understand information about oneself. In this self-subsistent disclosure in the care of one's personal existence, the voice is one's own essential ways of being him self essentially emerging in his own personal existence in one another.

The question of how or when or where it is that persons are possibly able to come to the point of more and more adequately envisioning their being-in-their-own-creation personally, and so better understand their own creative possibilities, and so come to know more and more who they are in their own ways of being themselves essentially, is not answerable by persons epistemologically either practically or logically tracing their creation and creative existence to a contingently-present-at-hand time and place and circumstance, either in or outside of themselves. From a metalogical prophetic perspective, the most that can be adequately said in modesty is that men are in-creation; they are created and creating and exist to the extent that they are seeing and hearing and speaking. Necessary conditions of men's seeing and hearing and speaking are transcending response and self-perception in personal existence. A necessary condition of response and self-perception in personal existence is personal self-subsistence. In the destiny of one's own personal self-subsistence in his own care, he may possibly know more and more who he essentially is in his own creation and creating.

Something of a prophetic epistemology of the creation and annihilation of man may possibly be grasped through an artist's myth. Presumably, the essential possibility of person's being themselves essentially in their own ways of being themselves in themselves and each other in divine light is being and ecstatically becoming artists. In due course of time, each person becomes mature in his artistry to the point that who he himself essentially is in himself and each other is expressed maturely. Something meaningful and significant, then, of who each person essentially is is identifiable in maturely observing his artistic expressions. Each painter constantly paints in his own mature ex-pressing himself. There is a one-ness in his ex-pressing himself in that he constantly ex-presses himself in and from his own personal style of being himself essentially in his own ways of being himself. At the same time, no two of his paintings are ever exactly the same and his ex-pressions are many. But in each expression of his im-pressions the twoness of

Creator God, who is the ground of his being both in his possibility and in his facticity.

The creation and existence of men, however, is not essentially an objective event of efficient, material causality like the making of a hoe or a sword. Men are in-creation and exist to the extent that they are seeing and hearing and speaking; which is a transcending-subjectivity-objectivity in existence, i.e., always must in some sense be in a character of wholeness and oneness as well as twoness and manyness. The deficiencies of presuming that creation is an objective phenomenon become more and more evident in the uncovering in existence of the transcending-subjectivity-objectivity of personhood in worldhood.

Miracle

It is usual to suppose that miracles are objective phenomena. This illusion arises from the practical, and to that extent fruitful, pursuit of life objectively in its usual everyday dimensions. The progressive rise of culture involves the breaking down more and more of this way of viewing the meanings of life. In its final stages of breaking down, the realization emerges that the miraculous cannot be objectively perceived. This is not to say that there is no objective correlate in the miraculous. The objectivity of the miraculous is such, however, that the meaning and significance of its nature cannot be conclusively demonstrated and understood as such.

Miracle is a trans-subjective-objective-being-in-one-another of God and men. Though awareness of God in events increases as sensitivity to this being-in enlarges, miracle has to do more particularly with the nature and meaning of personal existence as being-in-one-another of God and men. This awareness is never complete in the sense that it is no longer subject to the need for continual openness of a person to others and to the divine presence and activity. It is open to ever-increasing maturity in the refinement and comprehensiveness of this sensitivity.

The disadvantage of the illusion of miracle as an objective phenomenon is its tendency to thwart this openness to the being-in-one-another-of-God-and-men and its possibility of ever-increasing perceptual awareness of being-in the miraculous dimensions of human existence.

Prophecy

It is usual to suppose that prophecy is an objective function and that prophets are objectively discernible; that is, that prophecy has to do essentially with the prediction of the time, space, and objectivity of a course of events that is occurring and will occur in the future, and that the perceiving of the meaning and significance of prophecy and prophets is accomplished by a tabulation of the accuracy of predictions. In this view, prophets are presumed to be recognizable by a peculiar and characteristic prophetic appearance or garment or habit of one kind or another, or utterance.

This illusion arises in the confusing of prophecy with various forms of second sight and extrasensory perception whose practitioners do occasionally seem to possess an uncanny ability for this kind of objectively oriented prediction. It breaks down to the extent that the complexification of culture shows the meaning and significance of lives to be transcendently subjective-objective in existence.

Man

It is usual to suppose that the nature and meaning of human life is perceived objectively. This illusion arises in the case of perceiving the ready-to-hand and present-at-hand objective correlates of man's existence, including the corporeal correlates of his own life. Consequently, men's relationships with themselves and each other are characterized by objective manipulation with its corresponding in humanity. Inhumanity characteristically involves persons in misjudging, misunderstanding, indifference, war, separation, divorce, estrangement, etc.

Men's humane relationships increase when this illusion breaks down, which allows men more and more to be in each other in more fruitful ways, as well as to be with and meet and confront one another. They are thus able to relate essentially in their existence and are thereby enabled to adjust gradually to one another more and more appropriately in both smaller and larger groups, communities, and institutions. The breaking down of this illusion arises from the trans-subjective-objective ways of being in existence.

An additional disadvantage of this way of conceiving men's ways of being is its inadequacy in accounting for mystery in life. In this connection, certain highly cultured segments of civilization have historically accounted for mystery by either dismissing it outright as superstitious which it often is or so structuring the intellectual pursuits involved that it is not considered in the structure. These accounts, however, do not actually account for the total phenomena of life. They do have the advantage that objective science in general

possesses i.e., the isolation of a particular segment of reality to work progressively more objectively to overcome its problems. These successes, however, ought not to be construed to qualify as an adequate basis for appropriate ways of viewing the whole of life. This ought not to be based upon the consequent atrophy of wonder and awe which are so vital to life.

God

It is usual to suppose either that the absence of objective perceptions of God indicates the absence of God or that the presence of these perceptions are necessary in establishing the presence of God. In these suppositions, the existence-essence (presence) of God is equated with objective perceptions of God. These equations suffer the deficiency of all conceptions which equate presence and absence with the objectivity of perceptions of presence and absence. This is not to say that there are no objective correlates of the presence-absence of God. These correlates, however, are not adequate in determining the meaning and significance of this presence-absence.

These illusions of objectivity in their relationships to conceiving the existence-essence of God contribute to the formation of some complexly interwoven combinations of theism-atheism. Some forms of atheism are grounded in the conception that the absence of objective perceptions of God indicates the absence of God (while assuming that presence and absence are determined objectively). On the other hand, some forms of traditional Christian theism and the theism of the oriental tradition conceive the absence of objective perceptions of God to indicate not that God is absent but that God is nonobjective. Other forms of traditional Christian theism and oriental tradition conceive the existence of God to be in some sense demonstrable objectively or in nature, while various forms of atheism either concede that an objective demonstration would negate atheism or would confirm the existence of God as finite (natural, objective, demonstrable) by negating the existence of God as infinite.

Each of these conceptions, both theistic and atheistic, are defective in conceiving the existence-essence (presence) of God to be an objective phenomenon. Presence (existence-essence), however, is a personal being-in-one-another-essentially and is trans-subjective-objective-being-in in its way of being. It has the character of wholeness and oneness as well as twoness and manyness. This, then, is not to say that this being-in-one-another-essentially is one of complete conformity or exact equality in all of its dimensions. It is, however, in an essential sense, a vitally tenable cohabitation.

Subjectivity 'In' Existence

The World

When objectivity as a world-view has been shown in developing Western epistemological sophistication to be inadequate, philosophers have turned to subjectivity. Descartes, Hume, and Kant have made extensive contributions to the uncovering of the subjectivity of perception/conception/consciousness. In Jaspers, Marcel, Heidegger, and Sartre are indications that the problem is one of transcending the subjective-objective dichotomy though the exact and complete nature of this transcendence remains unclarified. Subjective philosophy and, subsequently, existentialism have not yet dealt comprehensively enough with the problems of subjectivity, however, to make their efforts adequate for modern Christian philosophy.

Culture

With increasing cultural complexity, it is more and more often held that meaning and significance are subjective phenomena. This illusion is one of idealism; that is, that our usual processes of seeing and hearing are either far removed from the really essential processes of discovering the truth or that they can in reality in no way be involved in these processes, which are, rather, subjective processes.

Subjectivity is founded in the attempt to solve, for example, the epistemological problem of objectivity by devising its antidote. In its increasing sophistication, this response to naive objectivity is accompanied by more and more subtle and complex combinations of the ideas that subjects can never be sure that they see and hear in common the same or that things can not be known as they are in themselves. These impressions are at times accompanied by the conclusions that subjects have no Being, or that they cannot be the same, or that they have no essence as objects have, or that they simply have no essence, or that there are no universals, or that reality is only subjectively relative.

Subjectivity begins to break down as philosophical sophistication begins to transcend its traditional

CHAPTER 12 – Prophetic Epistemology

Practical-everyday epistemology is an attempt persons make to know what to do to solve their practical-everyday problems. For the most part, this epistemology is object-oriented and has to do with the manipulation of objects. Empirical observation and experimentation is the method of this epistemology. Rational epistemology is an attempt persons make to know Reality beyond the limitations of the senses. For the most part, this epistemology is subject-oriented and has to do with the manipulation of thoughts. Logic is the method of this epistemology. Though in a certain sense these are different approaches to knowing Reality, they have been correlated or each has had its advocates over against the other as the best or the only way of really knowing Reality, yet they, nevertheless, in another sense, have something in common, viz., they both are most appropriately applicable to problems in which the-what-it-is of Reality is being investigated.

These epistemological methods have seldom been employed in investigating the question of the meaning and significance of the creation and annihilation and existence of man. Occasionally, however, whether explicitly or implicitly, they are applied to the question by taking men to be created and existing and annihilated as creatures that are present-at-hand as contingent to the cosmos or God or the environment or heredity. So these attempts to find out epistemologically what the creation and existence and annihilation of man is apply epistemological methods suited to inquiring into the creation and existence and annihilation of whatever is contingently-present-at-hand. The senses are employed empirically, and the mind rationally, in trying to discover what the creation and annihilation of man are. Empirically, man's creation and annihilation are taken to be objective events. Rationally, they are taken to be subjective events, including (somehow) an emanation from absolute Ideal forms outside of themselves.

So, proximally and for the most part, in accordance with his existence as lost, these epistemologies have the character of proceeding in their development from man as fallen from and so fleeing from himself as fleeing toward an epistemological contingency to which he may attach himself securely. In other words, he seeks an epistemological verification external to himself of what his creation and existence and annihilation are so, in taking himself to be contingent as present-at-hand, he seeks outside of himself to know the nature and source of his creation.

In preclassical prophecy, the source of his creation which he seeks to know is the cosmos, including God. Classical prophecy is unusual here in its poetic description of the creation of man as a gathering together of men and nations in peace, joy, and justice in divine light. The logical stage of postclassical prophecy has the character of absolutizing truth into a realm by itself in terms of language and, especially, ideas to which men must somehow conform if they are to epistemologically come to the truth, including a knowledge of (and a most appropriate being of) themselves and their creation and annihilation. In certain practical-everyday and logical (metaphysical) senses there are empirical and rational ways of knowing (including ourselves) which are more or less effective in solving practical-everyday and logical (metaphysical) problems. These ways of knowing, however, are not adequate to know ourselves in the sense of understanding our personal creation and existence and annihilation since who we are is not essentially present-at-hand as essentially contingent to some Reality outside of ourselves in our own personal creation and existence and annihilation, and so is not essentially amenable to those practical-everyday and logical methods of knowing things which are more applicable to whatever is contingently-present-at-hand.

Who we are personally manifests itself essentially in being an issue in and for ourselves and others as to who we ourselves essentially are in our own essential ways of being ourselves in our own care, even though who we essentially are, and this clue that we are who we essentially are, is proximally and for the most part lost in personal existence as embodying lacks and notness in our own ways of being ourselves essentially. As such, man is a self-subsistent embodiment in one's own care in which one's own personal existence is essentially his own possibility of being himself essentially. Since one's own personal existence is essentially an embodiment in one's own personal existence in and for and of one's own ways of being himself-essentially in his own care, he himself is himself essentially a revelation in and of and for and to himself and others as to who he himself really is. As such, he himself is essentially a revelation of and in and for his own creation and existence and annihilation.

But in being-lost proximally and for the most part from who they essentially are, persons overlook themselves as a revelation of who they themselves essentially are in their own creation and existence and annihilation, and so attempt to find them outside of themselves in looking for that present-at-hand reality to which their creation is contingent, and so come to know what their creation is and how it came about. So they come to flee from themselves to come to know

self-subsistence in one's own personal existence as being too destructively and atheistically prideful are overlooking the confusion here between the authentic pride of being-in-creation personally and the spiritually annihilating inauthentic humility of overcoming pride by taking oneself to be contingently-present-at-hand to God as present-at-hand as a created creature. Being-in-one's-creation-personally-in-one's-own self-subsistent-care is at the same time (ecstatically) one's own possibility of being-in-divine-creation personally, whose personal-divine possibility of being-in creation and annihilation is only possible personally in one's own self-subsistent care. Otherwise there is no personal creation and annihilation, but only the producing of something contingently present-at-hand from which it is impossible to create something existing personally. Only then is the fulfillment of the prophetic immanuel (God is with [in] us personally) personally possible. And only then is freedom possible as a personal participation in the creation and creating (revealing) of who I myself am in my own ways of being myself essentially.

In so responding to these criticisms, metalogical prophecy is at the same time putting the problem of theological anthropomorphism in a new perspective. Although it grants to postclassical logical prophecy the authenticity of the insight that preclassical prophecy is too theologically anthropomorphic in picturing God to be like we understand him to be in our practical-everyday theology, yet it sees that logical prophecy, in understanding Divine creativity as an Idealistic present-at-hand-contingent creating, is not theologically anthropomorphic enough. So, then, divine creativity is best observed modestly in being-in-personal-creativity inasmuch as here is a coincidence of divine-personal creativity. Without knowing all about divine creativity, it is at least possible to observe something of divine creativity here.

What, then, do we observe concretely in envisioning divine creativity in personal existence? When so observed, four aspects of divine-personal-creativity are out-standing. Divine-personal-creativity is Reserved and Serene and is always a personal response and is so as being-in-one-another-personally-as-creatively in and from their-own-ways-of-being-themselves-essentially in their-own-care. The Divine-Reserved-Serene-Creator-creating-in-personal-creation is who is housing everyone in his appropriate place and time as allotting everyone, to that place (existentially) and time (ecstatically) where (existentially) and when (ecstatically) by their nature (essentially) they belong, and may possibly authentically respond personally in and for and to themselves and each other essentially in their own ways of being themselves essentially in their own care.

A significant stage in the spiritual annihilation of man is the loss of the divine dimension in personal existence, which is a loss of divine creativity, which is a spiritual annihilation of the divine. The divine dimension and creativity is lost in persons falling away from themselves as to who they essentially are and into practical-everyday and Ideal worlds in which both God and men are comported toward in such a way that they are distinguished and united and identified as creating (Creator) and created as contingent and present-at-hand.

In this circumstance, we may not appropriately, and should not attempt to make for ourselves, a God by either cunning or common sense and thus replace this lack by force. We may not appropriately and should not attempt to accommodate ourselves simply by calling on an accustomed God. What is most appropriate in an era of the death both of the practical-everyday Gods of common sense and the God of logic is, modestly and without fear of Godlessness to remain near and be-in the Serene Reserved in our own personal existence in each other in care in such a way that, by observing more delicately and critically the divine creative dimension in our own personal existence, we may possibly be-in-creation more and more meaningfully and significantly, and so metalogically better understand the prophetic theology of the divine-creation-creating-creator.

subjective-objective dichotomy. This transcendence is grounded in the shift of philosophical anthropology away from looking upon man as being in the world substantially to the recognition of the existentiality of the personhood of being-in-the-world, whose most primordial characteristic is care. This shift shows subjectivity itself as an illusion, i.e., that there are anthropological universals and that persons are in a common world in which there are dimensions of seeing and hearing and knowing alike where they see as they are seen and know as they are known. An essence of being-persons-in-the-world is being-uncovering in this transcendence. In this uncovering is shown an essential sameness in personhood even in the various ways in which each person is essentially himself. There are, then, ways in which the significance of life finds common dimensions throughout the personhood of worldhood.

The discovery that subjectivity is an inadequate worldview produces curiosity, surprise, anguish, distrust, disgust, debate, war, strife, suspicion, hatred, contempt, concern, apathy, striving, convincing, argumentation, etc. These events are accompanied by ever-greater possibilities and dimensions of seeing and hearing and speaking; that is, of creating and envisioning the meaning and significance of life.

Creation

Creation is sometimes held to be a subjective phenomenon, viz., that it is solely and wholly constituted from resources within a subject (person) (God). This precept arises in the attempt to distinguish between subjective and objective phenomena (and noumena), which itself arises in the attempt to found the solution to the problem of objectivity in the alternative of subjectivity. This distinction is a dualism of that which is within a person (or god) and that which is outside a person. One facet of this subjectivity is creation *ex nihilo*. Traditional Christian dogmas of creation are in a perpetual state of confusion, for example, with regard to relating and distinguishing between subjective creative ideas and their objectively created counterparts. This confusion involves among other things the extent of the precision and nature of the correlation between the image (form, pattern) of creation and its realization. Indicating this confusion is the typical dogma that the Bible shows us the entire man as the work of the Creator God, who is the ground of his being both in his possibility and in his facticity.

The creation and existence of men, however, is not essentially a subjective state of formal causality in which a subjective-objective phenomenon (a person) is manufactured subjectively-objectively *ex nihilo* from a preexisting idea or form. This illusion begins to break down in the inevitable failure of all attempts to distinguish rigorously and completely between, and then properly relate, subjective and objective and to show the precise point of connection between the two. It does so more and more as the subtleties of the problem complexify. The inevitability of this failure is due to the transcendent-subjectivity-objectivity in the existence of persons in the world, whose dimensions do not fracture along a line split so precisely in this way.

Miracle

With increasing cultural sophistication, miracle is more and more presumed to be subjective, that is, a projecting of a notion of actions of God into unusual and remarkable events whose actual source is rather a personal projecting of one's own self or some aspect thereof into the events. Though this creating of God in one's own image is a characteristic phenomenon of human existence, its confusion with miracle as such becomes more and more evident as the transsubjectivity-objectivity of miracle does so. This is not to say that there is no subjective correlate in the miraculous. The subjectivity of the miraculous is such, however, that its significance in human existence cannot properly be understood solely as such.

Miracle is a trans-subjective-objective-being-in-one-another of God and men. Though awareness of God in events increases as sensitivity to this being-in enlarges, miracle has to do more particularly with the nature and meaning of one's own existence as a person whose person is a being-in-one-another of God and men.

The disadvantage of confusing miracle with the more familiar subjective projecting of one's self as God unusual and remarkable events is the corresponding thwarting of the perceptual awareness of the being-in-one-another of God and men and its creative bringing forth of the miracles of human existence.

Prophecy

As culture complexifies, prophecy is sometimes confusedly taken to be a subjective phenomenon, that is, that it is mostly or wholly a product of the inner resources of a visionary type person or that it is hallucination or imagination or views and insights left mostly or wholly to the subject's discretion. It is sometimes taken to be a network of forms which a worldless subject has laid over some kind of material. It is also

taken to be a divine *imprimatur* upon man's subconscious mind and then becomes objective. Prophetic time is here seen to be subjective, that is, time which is not related directly to factual events. Reportedly successful predictions of future events prior to their occurrence are said to actually have been made *vaticinia ex eventu* after the fact.

This confusion generally arises as a sophisticated reaction against the naive objectivity of second sight and extrasensory perception as modes of interpreting the significance of existence. It breaks down to the extent that the complexification of culture shows the significance of lives to be transcendently-subjective-objective in existence.

Man

That the nature and meaning of human existence is a subjective relationship to an objective world is a philosophical development which has arisen as a sophisticated criticism of naive objectivity. A subtle consequence of philosophical subjectivity has been an epistemological isolating of man in the world, with its corresponding inhumaneness. Men's humane relationships are better seen with the breaking down of this isolation, which allows men more and more sensitivity to being in each other. They are thereby assisted in adjusting to one another more and more appropriately. This breaking down arises from the trans-subjective-objective ways of being personal in existence. In these ways of being, men are gradually more and more perceptive of and responsive to themselves and each other essentially.

In addition to the inhumaneness of this subjectivity, its disadvantage is its ways of conceiving of mystery in life; for example, the confusion of mystery and superstition. This way of looking at mystery, however, does not actually account for mystery-in-life adequately.

God

As culture complexifies, it is held more and more that the existence of God is subjective, that is, that it is an explanatory means of accounting for those events which are privately perceived as remarkably extraordinary and which, it is felt, cannot be accounted for in any other conceivable way; or, that it is wish-fulfillment or imagination or hallucination. These explanations of God as subjective phenomena are defective in overlooking the existence-essence of God and men as a trans-subjective-objective-being-in-one-another personally, and in the confusing of this being-in with the subjective projections of self as God in the wish-fulfillments, imaginations, and hallucinations which actually do at times take place in human existence.

possibly insecure noncontingent creatively self-subsistent who-they really-are is an imaging of God as that Creator to whom persons may become securely contingent in their existence as created. When persons in the fear of their presumably possible noncontingent insecurity flee from themselves to be contingent to God as Creator, both God and personal creation and personal existence as contingent to God and God as Creator are taken to be so as present-at-hand usually inadvertently. But this personal creation and personal existence and Divine creation and Divine existence as Creator turn out to be a spiritual annihilation of personal and divine existence as contingently-present-at-hand personal possibilities, since neither personal possibilities nor divine creativity in personal possibility are possible as contingently-present-at-hand. Personal possibilities and divine creativity in personal possibilities are only possibilities whenever persons possibilities are an issue for and in themselves as to who they essentially are personally in their own ways of being themselves essentially in themselves and each other in their own divine creativity in their own care.

Whether God or men or Ideal forms are identified either implicitly or explicitly as the contingently-present-at-hand what properties of the cosmos in terms of being essentially the substantial properties of or the ground of, or the essences of things in a timeless realm of Ideal absolutes, or being derived therefrom or being in some combination thereof, they are incompatible with the revelation of creation in personal existence. In the difficulties and impossibilities of finding the personal realities in care on either or both sides of, and the personal connections between, these present-at-hand dualistic contingencies, the realities of the creation of man are lost. When, then, God and man and the creation of man are so comported toward the creation of man becomes a present-at-hand reality contingent upon a present-at-hand God apart from which he has no reality in and of himself. Personal realities are thus really spiritually annihilated in spite of the religio-philosophical proclamations in the face of these contingencies that man (somehow) is nevertheless really someone who is really there now and really free and really a responsible being and (somehow) has been created as such. When the creation of man by God is so conceived it is a confusion between a creation and a producing (manufacturing) of man, and as such does not reach his authentic being-in-creation personally in his own care.

The death of God and the annihilation of man are correlates of the same phenomena in human existence, viz., persons being lost in falling from themselves as to who they essentially are in the creativity of being themselves essentially in their own care, including every form of taking divine and personal existence to be contingently-present-at-hand. In this circumstance, we may not appropriately, and should not attempt to make for ourselves a God by either cunning or common sense and thus replace this lack by force. We may not appropriately and should not accommodate ourselves simply by calling on an accustomed God.

Metalogical postclassical prophecy envisions the creation and annihilation of man in personal existence ontologically and anthropologically as being a person's noncontingent-self-subsistent certain possibility in personal existence of creating and annihilating himself as to who he is in his own ways of being himself essentially from his own always already ecstatically being-in his own creation and annihilation. At the same time, it envisions the creation and annihilation of man in personal existence sociologically as persons being-in each other transcendently in their own care in such a way that they are the personal potentiality for, and are essentially, coming-to-be-in-one-another-in-their-own-ways-of-being-themselves-essentially so care-fully that they universalize and group and individualize themselves in such a way that they are finding and becoming and, as such, creating who they essentially are in and from themselves and each other. Metalogic prophetic sociologically transcending self-subsistent personal ontology and anthropology seem vulnerable to criticism as necessarily idolatrous-atheistic-theological-personally-destructive pride on the grounds that man was created by God and is therefore necessarily contingent to God, and as such cannot be self-subsistent.

But this criticism is made from a perspective in which personal and divine existence are taken to be contingently present-at-hand whether inadvertently or not and is not yet grounded in an ontology of personal existence itself. Proximally and for the most part, the phenomena of self-subsistence in the creation and annihilation of man in personal existence which are constantly showing themselves are overlooked and misunderstood in persons being fallen from themselves. These oversights and misunderstandings develop from not envisioning phenomenologically in a fuller and more constant manner the existential constitution of personal existence. Ontologically, man is different from every non-personal contingently-present-at-hand Reality. His self subsistence is not based on the substantiality of a substance but on the self-subsistence of himself as existing in his own care. So his creation and annihilation and any divine dimension in his creation and annihilation is in his self subsisting existing in himself as existing in his own care.

Criticisms of the in-sight in envisioning the creation and annihilation of man in the personal

and a present-at-hand body concomitantly by a present-at-hand God (as *ens infinitum*) from a present-at-hand nothing contingently, as though this implication were very meaningful and significant in personal existence. But this turns out to be an annihilation (spiritual) of who persons essentially are, since they reveal themselves to be essentially who they themselves essentially are in their own care in being an issue for themselves and are not present-at-hand. How, then, is this revelation of personal existence in personal existence related to the theological questions of idolatry and atheism and the nature of creation-creator?

From the perspective of metalogical prophecy, the proclamations of preclassical, classical, and logical prophecy against idolatry and atheism are too immodest and too simple. Only in postclassical prophecy does the question develop, Can man ever experience and understand all that the divine is? And only metalogical prophecy inquires into the theologically oriented questions of the meanings and significance of the creation of man with the modesty of starting with the realization that man cannot ever experience and understand all that the divine is. Nevertheless, metalogical prophecy envisions certain modest possibilities of seeing the divine in personal existence and so understanding something of the creator in (and) the creation of man. These possibilities are only possible, however, when one sees that personal existence is essentially possibility and is not created as contingent to God as (both being) present-at-hand but is (are both) creative possibility, and that it is impossible for man to know all that God is. Metalogical prophecy, then, begins modestly to understand something of the meaning and significance of the tradition that God created man in his own image.

Understanding what (who) God is (was) and what creation is (was) is prerequisite to understanding God created or God creates. But, possibly, understanding all that God is (was) and all that creation is (was) is not prerequisite to understanding something of creation and the divine dimension in creation. And, possibly, understanding something of what being created (being-in creation) personally is helps to understand something of what creation (and creator) is (was). These possibilities then are not seen in metalogical prophecy to be contingent to the necessity of beginning with God or all that God is to understand something of the creation of man and the creator since persons are already really in themselves here in being-in their own care creatively, and may so possibly understand themselves. So these possibilities of understanding the creation-creator of man are certainly possible since they are grounded in personal existence itself, which, as an issue for and in itself in one's own care is a creative possibility in oneself, and, as such, persons are a revelation of creativity and creation and may possibly be understood as such. One's own creativity and being-in creation personally is really, then, the closest revelation of the essence of creativity and creation which one may encounter (be-in).

Metalogical prophecy coincides with the theological tradition in seeing creativity to be a divine dimension. It transcends the tradition, however, in envisioning a divine human coincidence in creativity. In the confusion, then, of simply and immodestly presuming that, since man is a fallen being and as such worships the creature more than the Creator, that he is fallen only in being fallen away from the Creator, the theological tradition has overlooked the critical possibility in understanding the creation and annihilation of man theologically that persons are first fallen from themselves. Being-fallen from themselves as to who they themselves essentially are, they are then fallen from (in) being-in creation personally. In being-fallen from (in) being-in creation personally, they are fallen from being-in the creator. This confusion leads to the further confusion that the most adequate place to begin overcoming their idolatrous atheistic estrangement from God is to flee from themselves as fallen creatures and first find out who God is so that they may find out who they are. In this confusion in fleeing from himself, what one overlooks is the more certain and at the same time the more modest possibility of uncovering creativity and creation in himself as being the closest revelation of creativity as being-in-creation personally, and so more certainly recover something of the creative dimension of (in) divine creativity. This hope is further predicated on the revelation of personal noncontingency to one's birth as one's creation. One may then understand something of the revelation of creativity and creation and so divine creative dimensions which he himself is personally as being-in-creation personally without having to know all that birth as creation is.

Idolatry involves a lack in being-lost to and in (a) divine dimension(s) in personal existence by way of persons being-lost in falling away from their own ways of being themselves essentially. Men, as proximally and for the most part lost, are for the most part idolatrous. An idolatry that they flee toward in fleeing from themselves as to who they themselves essentially are in the fear of the

CHAPTER 2 – Transcendence and ‘Being-In’

Transcending-Subjectivity-Objectivity ‘In’ Existence

The World

When the world is referred to as those entities (objects) with which men dwell or as the seeing of entities beside which men live in the image of one's self (subjects) by his projecting himself into the entities around him, then in both of these depictions the more primordial phenomenon of world as worldhood has not yet been reached, although in both of these ways of depicting the world worldhood has been presupposed. Worldhood is a way of being of each person in entities and in each other personally.

The relational character of this personally-being-in is existential more than substantial or imaginary. More than being spatial or whimsically created, these personal relationships are significant. Worldhood is that relational totality which is significant. Significance is those ways of being manifesting themselves and being-uncovering which each person is essentially in his existence, i.e., in his relationships in and with himself, others, and all entities in and with which men dwell. Significance is thus trans-subjective-objective in its personal relationality in its worldhood.

Culture

With increasing cultural complexification, worldhood is uncovered more and more. Culture is the manifestation of meaning and significance in life in the essential relationality of personal existence, in which that which each person essentially is emerges in his existence.

In some sense, this uncovering shows the meaning of life to be the same, namely, in the universal commonness of personhood in worldhood. In another sense, however, this uncovering shows each life to be essentially different in his own particular and personal way of relating to, with, and in others.

This trans-subjectivity-objectivity of culture is in the personal worldhood of its relationality of significance. The significance of the life of each person is in the complexification of culture in which his transcendent-subjectivity-objectivity shows more and more in this increasing complexity the essence of his life in his existence in its essential relations in and with every other essence in his existence.

The uncovering of this transcendent-subjectivity-objectivity of personhood in worldhood is accompanied by counseling, caucusing, compromise, education, understanding, dialogue, reformed reunion, vitality, being-in-mystery, etc. These events are accompanied in turn by ever-greater possibilities of seeing and hearing and speaking, that is, of envisioning and creating miraculously and prophetically the meaning and significance of life.

Creation

When creation is presumed to be the making of objects or the simple projecting of one's self into events, then the creative essence of personhood in worldhood is not yet reached. Creation is the emergence of essence in existence. The context of this bringing forth is personhood in worldhood. Its mode is the seeing, hearing, and speaking of the transcending-subjective-objective-personal-being-in-one-another of response and self-perception in personal existence.

Men are in-creation; they are created and creating and exist to the extent that they are seeing and hearing and speaking; which are transcendently-subjective-objective-being-in-existence, i.e., always must in some sense be in a character of wholeness and oneness as well as twoness and manyness in personal existence. Necessary conditions of men's seeing and hearing and speaking are transcending response and self-perception in personal existence. If and what a *preresponding* and *preself-perceiving* (or post) person might be is a speculation whose conceptual content remains in darkness. (The pure that it is shows itself, but the Whence and the whither remain in darkness. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, p. 172; and Buber, *The Knowledge of Man*, P. 59.) To try to discover the concrete conceptual content of what now is limited to a speculative abstraction is not necessarily prerequisite to at least some significance in the what of the that it

is which shows itself in personal existence; nor does speculation here show itself to be fruitful except as perhaps a very limited pioneering possibility when still based upon personhood and creation as response and self-perception of transcending-objectivity-subjectivity-in-existence.

An important instance of inadequacy on this point is the traditional Christian dogma of *Creation ex nihilo*. *Creation ex nihilo* as traditionally held is in a state of perpetual confusion between the objectivity and the subjectivity of creation. The difficulty of its subjectivity is in relating and distinguishing between subjective creative ideas and their objectively created counterparts, of its objectivity in distinguishing between manufacturing and creating.

Clarity begins to emerge here in the uncovering of the nothingness of transcending-subjectivity-objectivity. *Creation ex nihilo* as a confusion between the objectivity and subjectivity of creation is seen as an attempt to ground itself in them as being-present-at-hand from not-being-present-at-hand. This being from not-being is a definite sort of being which, however, is one of being-present-at-hand rather than a being-of-persons-in-the-world. In the being-of-persons-in-the-transcending-subjectivity-objectivity-in-personal-existence, the not-being is not a present-at-hand-not-being of a missing or not-yet object or subject, but is a not-being which remains distinct from any not-being or not-having-been present-at-hand. It is rather a notness of the potentiality of being persons in which every person is one who always stands in one possibility or another, and who as such is, at the same time, not other possibilities.

Another dimension of the not-being in personal existence is the not-yet-being what one becomes (actual-authentic-essential) while at the same time being-potentially what one becomes. The directionality of this not-being is from potential to actual. *Creation ex nihilo* in personal existence is a bringing forth of the essential ways of being of a person in his transcending-subjective-objective-potential for being-himself-essentially-and-not-other possibilities. This being-himself-essentially is brought forth miraculously in the personally-being-in-each-other-of-God-and-men-in-crisis.

Miracle

A miracle is essentially neither the remarkable manipulation of objects in an awe-inspiring way which is obviously perceived as divine by positively being beyond human capacity, nor is it a projecting of a conception of God as acting into unusual and remarkable events whose actual source is rather a personal projecting of one's self as God into these events. A miracle is essentially a trans-subjective-objective-being-in-one-another of God and men. Its context is the creative bringing forth of essence in personal existence. Its mode of existence is crisis and its resolution. The objective and subjective correlates of personal existence are either so evident (objectivity) or so ideally persuasive in the refinement of sophisticated deliberation (subjectivity) that crisis is usually overlooked as the primary mode of existence through and in which their miraculous transcendence is enabled creatively to bring forth essence in personal existence. Crisis is the breaking down of the worldly security of objectivity and subjectivity and the establishing of personal existence rather on the more fundamental basis of the miraculous being-in-one-another-personally-of-God-and-men, in whose mode essence emerges in personal existence in the most appropriate ways.

Prophecy

When prophecy is presumed to be the accurate prediction of the space, time, and circumstances of objective events or the imaginings of a person which are grounded in views or insights left mostly or wholly to his subjective discretion, then the essence of prophecy is not yet manifest. It is disclosed in the recognition that lives are more than objective-subjective functioning. The whole of life is greater than the total of its objective-subjective parts. Understanding the meaning and significance of lives analytically-synthetically is, consequently, inadequate. Prophecy is a trans-subjective-objective envisioning of the meaning and significance of lives, and to the extent that it is so is more adequate in understanding this significance. Prophecy is envisioning. Envisioning (in -visioning) is seeing more and more the meaning of life through and in life (in appearances and impressions). Envisioning life is in living. Envisioning life in living and the unveiling of lives in seeing shows the meaning of life more and more. Living is being-in-each-other-essentially. This seeing more and more the meaning of life arises in being-in-each-other-essentially, i.e., envisioning, which is essencing. Essence is the always characteristic way or ways of being-in this case of persons.

This showing and seeing more and more of life in its meaning is not automatic. It arises existentially in the devastating dynamic of being alive in each other essentially, which is not content to rest (though it is going nowhere in the sense of achieving what it is not. Tense and worried uncertainty as to how it will all come out is consequently unessential though existentially significant).

Real(ly something) by God. But is it not possible that just at this point is to be found that kind of confusion in which worshipping persons as creatures who are deemed to be entities who are caused to be persons and otherwise are-nothing-at-all, and a Creator that caused the creature to be as contingent to it from nothing at all, is really the idolatrous atheism?

And is it not possible that another closely related, delicate, and yet critical confusion is encountered at this point?

Traditionally it is said that, in his confusion, man worships the creature (himself) more than the Creator because he is a fallen being, that is, he is fallen away from his Creator. But possibly the first (ecstatically), and in that sense more crucial point here, is that he is fallen-away-from-himself and so is fallen-away-from-his-creator and can only authentically be restored to both by envisioning more and more adequately the nature of and overcoming of his estrangement from himself as at the same time (ecstatically) prerequisite to all reconciliations in personal existence.

But how is one to decide between these critical atheistic idolatrous-personal confusions? A vocation of metalogical postclassical prophecy is a tracing of this confusion with the modest hope of uncovering more delicate in-sight into the theological problem of understanding the annihilation of man toward implementing ecstatically (an understanding of) the creation of man and an understanding of the creator. The present era of the death of the practical-everyday God and the death of The Logos God is a sign of an era of the reemergence of eros and of some sort of possibility of and need for and manifestation of a transcending-metalogos-metaeros care-ful grasp of (a) Divine dimension(s) in personal existence.

A metalogical question of Divine and Human creativity is whether or not traditional perspectives imply that the creation of man is simply a production as produced by an external Divine (present-at-hand) source of contingency or an external will imposed upon personal existence arbitrarily or creating personal existence arbitrarily. Do these perspectives on the creation and annihilation of man involve implications of such a delicate and critical nature that persons so comporting themselves toward what they have considered to be their creation and Creator are not, but are rather comporting themselves toward an annihilation (spiritual) of themselves and of their creator and creation in their existence?

Divine and personal existence are traditionally related in a way which overlooks, and so misunderstands, possibilities of meaningful and significant relationships between (in) and aspects of the two which are seen to be possibilities when one sees creation and creativity to be possible dimensions both of Divine and personal existence. In their fleeing from in being-lost in their fallenness, men have traditionally so focused their attention on being fallen beings because they are fallen away from their Creator that they have for the most part overlooked the meanings of being-fallen from themselves, and so have overlooked possibilities of reconciliation in their own creation and personal clues toward better understanding of themselves and their Creator. In their fleeing from themselves in being-lost in the fallenness of their falling away from themselves as to who they themselves essentially are in their own ways of being-themselves essentially, persons have overlooked themselves as an essential clue to the possibilities of being-in and seeing divine dimensions in their personal existence. Another way of referring to what has been traditionally overlooked is to observe that neither the cosmological nor the ontological nor the teleological arguments for the existence of God can be appropriately related to the personal existence and annihilation and creation of (in) man unless, until, and to the extent that ontologies of the personal existence of man are manifest. Unless and until personal existence is manifest ontologically, these arguments are still essentially meaningless and insignificant regarding it.

So, from the perspective of metalogical postclassical prophecy, the philosophico-theological tradition of arguments for the existence of God and against idolatry and atheism are still too immodest and too simple. Postclassical metalogical modesty is not presuming to know that God exists or what God is, and so presuming to know what it means to say God created man in his own image, without first clarifying the personal existence side of the question ontologically as well as the Divine side at the same time (ecstatically). A vocation of metalogical prophecy is a theologically modest dismantling of these philosophico-prophetic dimensions to envision something of prophetic theology in the light of a developing ontologico-sociologico-anthropology of personal and divine existence in itself (themselves). In dismantling this tradition to the source of how persons comport themselves toward themselves in this tradition, metalogical prophecy finds a delicate yet critical confusion between creation and annihilation. What is implicit in this tradition in understanding that God created man in his own image is the implication usually inadvertent that this creation was (is) a present-at-hand bringing into being of a present-at-hand soul

CHAPTER 11 – Prophetic Theology

Theology traditionally presumes that until one knows what God is one cannot know much, if anything, about the meaning and significance of human existence. When one becomes aware of the significance of this theological concern, he proceeds to find out what God is to come to know the meaning and significance of his own existence.

In preclassical prophecy, God is revealed simply to be the Creator and Sustainer of the world, including human existence. Man is a created contingency to God, and when he finds out what God is and comes to know who he is, man finds that he is simply a creature who should be (but sometimes isn't) devoted to serve and worship the Lord(s) and supplicate him (them) continually for his welfare. This practical-everyday theology is object-oriented and sees God objectively. It is prone (when necessary) to the cosmological (or cosmological type), and to some extent the teleological (type), argument for the existence and nature of God. Implicit in each of these arguments is the view that man is created from, and the purposes in his existence arise in one way or another from, the cosmos as created by God. Making these views explicit, worship and supplication and service are astrological and anthropomorphic in the sense that God and the cosmos and our lives within the cosmos are purposeful like we understand them to be.

Classical prophetic theology is rare and unusual. Its transcending-subjective-objective vision is a poetic-prophetic envisioning of the divine glory filling the whole earth, but the people are dwindling away unaware for their ears are too heavy and drowsy and their eyes wander too much and are too proud and their feelings are too dull to behold the divine glory. Divine creative activity is not spoken of as a bringing man into being. Divine creativity is always the bringing into being of the gathering together of the sons and daughters of God and Israel from their darkness into his light which then brings forth their light.

Postclassical logical theology is subject-oriented and sees God subjectively. It is prone to the ontological and to some extent the teleological argument for the existence and nature of God. That is, if one thinks about it, it becomes self-evident and noncontradictable that God (the highest) (Being-itself) exists, from whom all other existence is derived (is predicated), including its purpose. Worship here is logical awe.

Both practical-everyday and logical theology begin from the premise God created man in his own image by making certain formal and informal abstract presumptions regarding the meaning and significance of God and create and man and image.

Both implicitly and explicitly, and formally and informally in the Hellenistic-Christian tradition, God is taken to be that omniscient, omnipotent, omnibenevolent, ultimate, eternally unchanging, transcendent (but [somehow] occasionally imminently intervening miraculously in human history) Reality to which all other Reality is contingent and without which it would be-nothing-at-all.

Creation is taken to be that coming-into-being (as Reality) which otherwise is - nothing-at-all and which is created as contingent to and caused by God. Man is comported toward as an entity created by God, but in the special way of having been created in the image of God either (in some sense) objectively or subjectively (as a rational entity) or perhaps as both objectively and subjectively (in some dualistic sense or another).

One not subscribing to or having reservations about this theological tradition is looked upon as being atheistic and idolatrous. But the metalogical prophetic question here is whether or not the creation and annihilation of man and the nature of personal existence itself and divine dimensions in personal existence are yet envisioned delicately and critically enough that we are at this point so far beyond idolatrous and atheistic confusion that it is now clear that man was created (came-into-being) and otherwise was (is) nothing-at-all by that (logically highest in all categories) God to whom he is contingent as the cause of his Reality (Being).

It is precisely at this point that one encounters what has not been considered to be, yet what is nevertheless the very delicate and critical question of certain facets of the nature and possibilities of (theological) pride and humility in personal existence. Idolatrous atheistic and, so, destructive pride is taken to be worshipping the creature more than the Creator in such a way that creature is presumed (logically) necessarily to be that entity who is caused to be and otherwise is-nothing-at-all and Creator is presumed (logically) necessarily to be that entity that caused the creature to be from (and who would otherwise be) nothing at all. So, then, appropriate humility is taken to be the comporting of oneself toward himself and the acknowledgment of himself to be nothing-at-all except as he is contingent to, and so is caused to be

Unveilings of life occur in proportion to, and to the extent that, living enables itself and is enabled to see. In this seeing, persons see more and more as they are in the transcending-subjectivity-objectivity in which they are. Living is enabled to see the significance of life more and more through and in the contrast of crisis (hell, incompatibility, destruction, etc.) and peace (heaven, compatibility, correlation, construction, reconciliation, etc.).

All personal perception involves visibility, i.e., that which can be apprehended in vision that is, in envisioning. To the extent that a person is envisioning the meaning and significance of his world, he is in prophecy that is, in vision. Persons vary greatly in their consciousness of being in vision and in their abilities to make it visible. Envisioning is both passive and active: active to the extent that envisioning involves the effective participation of the seer in his world (overseeing) and passive to the extent that his participation is ineffective (underseeing).

The illusions of objectivity and subjectivity include the impressions that envisioning is neither desirable nor necessary nor possible. The disadvantages of these illusions include their tendencies to thwart the trans-subjective-objective envisioning of the significance of the lives of persons, i.e., of being-in-prophecy.

Man

The primary existential foundations of men's inhumane relationships are their considering and manipulating of themselves and each other as objects present-at-hand and their subjective isolation from one another. Humane relationality is grounded in the trans-subjectivity-objectivity-of-being-in-personal-existence in which these inadequacies break down. In this destruction of naive objectivity and traditional ontology, persons are gradually more and more sensitive of and responsive to themselves and each other essentially in their existence. Being-in-each-other characteristically involves them in judging, understanding, concern, peace, conciliation and reconciliation, marriage, friendship, love, fruitful compromise, acceptance, etc. This is not to say that these unions and reunions are of complete conformity or exact equality. They are, however, essentially vitally tenable cohabitations.

Humane relationality is also the foundation for an understanding of mystery in existence more adequate than the frequent confirming or denying of it as superstition or magic. Mystery in life is not so much that which is incomprehensible or inexperienceable or wondrously manipulable as it is those ways of being-in-life which *are*, but only arise between and in persons in that dialogic relationship of being-in-each-other whose common denominators are thereby more and more essentially understood, even though these understandings show themselves as neither objectively demonstrable nor subjectively imaginary, and though no technique for solving technical problems can make them known.

God

The conceiving of God or the essence-existence (presence) of God or various kinds of evidence or indications thereof as objectively perceivable, or the accounting for those events which are privately perceived as remarkably extraordinary by postulating God as acting therein in varying forms and combinations of both theism and atheism have not yet penetrated to the more primordial significance of the meaning of God in the world. This meaning of the presence of God is grounded in the ultimate significance of a personal being-in-one-another (one of whose dimensions is *ultimate* or better, *essential* concern) and is trans-subjective-objective-being-in in its way of being; that is, it has the character of wholeness and oneness as well as twoness and manyness without, however, complete conformity or exact equality in all of its dimensions while being essentially a vitally tenable cohabitation. In this character, it is also *ultimately* or *essentially* creative, comforting, negotiating, mysterious, involved in evil, disciplining, testing, penetrating, destroying, sacrificing, reconciling, redeeming, blessing, cursing, marrying, divorcing, just, merciful, passionate, etc.

This personal being-in-one-another of God and men is subject to the charge of anthropomorphism. The advantage of this charge is in its recognition of the weakness of an exact equation of God as personal with the objectively corruptible existential aspects of men's existence. Its disadvantage is in its overlooking of the trans-subjective-objective-in-ness of the existence-essence (presence) of God and men as being-in-one-another with its corresponding lack of awareness of this dimension of the meaning and significance of human existence.

Personal-Being-'In'-One-Another

The most basic problem of understanding the ontological situation of personally-being-in-one-another is the problem of seeing the ontological difference between this being-in and the being-in of a spatial (substantial) in-one-another-ness of things present-at-hand. By present-at-hand-being-in

(substantially) is meant the relationship of being which two entities extended in space have to each other with regard to their location in that space. Both the water in the glass and the coat in the closet are in space and at a location, and both in the same way. Being-in-one-another-personally, however, is a personal way of being whose way of being is not exclusively spatial, though one can and often does so understand this to be the nature of one's self and others from the fact that there is a spatial aspect of being personal which is noticeably visible.

At the same time, personal-being-in is not to be explained ontologically by some ontical characterization, as if one were to say, for instance, that it is a spiritual property, and that man's spatiality is a result of his bodily-corporeal nature. Here again we are faced with the being-present-at-hand-together of some such spiritual Thing along with a corporeal Thing a procedure motivated metaphysically by the naive supposition that man is, in the first instance, a spiritual Thing which subsequently gets misplaced into a space. Being-in-one-another-personally is rather a personal way of being which one should not think of as the being-present-at-hand of some spiritual Thing or corporeal Thing in an entity which is also present-at-hand. This personal way of being is not the same way of being as that of those entities whose way of being is being-present-at-hand.

Being-in-one-another-personally is thus an expression for the way of being of persons, whose beings-in-one-another are among their essential ways of being. This personal-being-in is not a spatial relationship of being-present-at-hand but is rather a personal way of being whose ontological categories are not spatial and temporal present-at-hand-ness but are rather personal existential categories. As an existential, being-in-one-another never means anything like the being-present-at-hand-together of Things that occur. There is no such thing as the side-by-side-ness of one person with another person who then come into each other as entities present-at-hand. Persons are in-one-another existentially, i.e., in terms of an in-ness which is not present-at-hand. Not until we understand being-in-one-another-personally as an essential way of being of persons whose categories are existential can we have any insight into the personhood of persons.

At the same time, another basic problem of understanding the ontological situation of personally-being-in-one-another is the problem of seeing the ontological difference between this being-in as a being-in-the-world and the being-of-the-present-at-hand-in-the-world. When one person is in another, it is not the case that one's own person is proximally present-at-hand-in-the-world-along-side the other person who is also proximally present-at-hand-in-the-world and then somehow come to be in each other. Personally-being-in-the-world is a different way of being than being-present-at-hand-in-the-world. By others is not meant here everyone else but me those over against whom the I stands out. They are rather those from whom, for the most part, one does not distinguish oneself those among whom one is too. This being-there-too with and in them does not have the ontological character of a being-present-at-hand-alone-with-and-in-them within a world. This with and in is something of the character of personhood; the too means a sameness of being as circumspectively concerned being-in-the-world which is grounded in care. By reason of this with-in-like being-in-the-world, the world is always my concernfully being-in and sharing-with others our personhood in care. This being-with-and-in-each-other-personally is disclosed within the world of personhood because each person is essentially being-with-and-in-each-other-personally. This being-with-and-in-each-other is an existential characteristic of personhood even when factually no Other is present-at-hand or empirically perceived. Even a person's being-alone is being-with-and-in-each-other-personally-in-the-world. The other can be missing only in and for this being-with-and-in-each-other-personally-in-the-world. On the other hand, and at the same time, a person can be-alone even if there are several other persons both present-at-hand and in him. So being-with-and-in-personally are not based on the occurrence together of several subjects or objects. Even, however, in our being-alone they are there with and in us or else there would be no being-alone or being-missing, both of which are possible only because personhood is being-with-and-in-each-other-personally-in-the-world.

When a person directs himself toward another person, he does not somehow first get out of an inner sphere in which he has been proximally encapsulated, but his being is such that he is always outside alongside persons which he is also with-and-in-a-world-together. Nor is any inner sphere abandoned when a person is with and in another. Even this being-outside-with-and-in-another is still inside; that is to say, it is itself inside as a being-in-the-world-with-others.

The fact that persons can have a relationship with one another is grounded in this most primordial phenomenon of being-in-one-another-personally-in-the-world. It follows that this primordial being-in is not a property which persons *have* or sometimes *have* and sometimes do not *have*, and without which could *be* just as well as they could *be* with it. It is not the case that each person *is* and then *has*, by way of an extra, a relationship-of-being toward each other in a world a relationship which he provides himself occasionally. A person is never proximally an entity which is, so to speak, free from this being-in, but which sometimes has the inclination to take up a relationship toward Others and the world. Taking up relationships toward one another in the world is possible only because persons, as being-in-one-another-in-the-world, are as they are. This state of being does not arise just because some person is present-at-hand outside of another person and meets up with him. Such persons can meet with one another only inasmuch as they are primordially in-one-another-in-

at-hand substantial being-in of Reality which personal existence essentially is not on the other. Whenever one sees through this confusion, he sees the sociological creation and annihilation of man taking place in persons being-in themselves and each other care-fully.

When one is not envisioning the sociological creation and annihilation of man taking place in persons being themselves in themselves and each other care-fully, there are critical aspects of sociological confusion pertaining to the meaning and significance of personal existence in addition to the problem of the imminence and transcendence of a contingently-present-at-hand dualism. For example, an appropriate correlation (being-in-one-another-personally) in the individualizing and grouping and universalizing persons in their existence is problematical. Underlying the sociological presumption that persons are sociologically among each other as contingently-present-at-hand, and as such exist as contingently-present-at-hand, is the presumption that all men are simply universally alike or are at least potentially the same. Logically, it seems as though, since all men as men are men, then all men are alike, at least potentially.

The project, then, of the creation of man is seen to be the creation of man in the image of... whether it be in the image of God for which as a child of God he is potential, or in my own image for which as being human like the rest of us he is potential, or in the image of The Ideal Man for which as a rational perceptor he may know himself and so be himself (and is potential). When persons relate to each other in a way which is taken to be sociologically adequate and helpful and creative by presuming them to be potentially the same as human beings (with the implied contingency-as-present-at-hand) and so to be a creating persons (in the image of), what it turns out to be is a project of producing persons (violently) in which an attempt is made to mold (create) the lives of each other as producing something socially desirable (violently) as being-contingently-present-at-hand (violence).

Metalogically, personal existence does manifest itself universally in the sense that persons are essentially themselves in their own ways of being themselves essentially in one another in their own care. The effect of this manifestation, however, when envisioned care-fully, leads persons to relate to one another sociologically in ways which are not contingently-present-at-hand; i.e., they are not busy creating each other as contingently-present-at-hand in their own contingently-present-at-hand images (nonviolently). They are rather coming-to-be-in-one-another-in their own ways of being-themselves-essentially so care-fully that they group and individualize themselves together in such a way that they find their own most appropriate group in which they most appropriately exist (nonviolently).

What, then, is considered from the perspective of contingently-present-at-hand sociology to be unjust inequality frequently turns out to be just inequality, and what is considered to be just equality frequently turns out to be unjust equality. Both unjust inequality and unjust equality turn out to be a spiritual annihilation (violence) in personal existence. Both just equality and just inequality turn out to be a spiritual creation (nonviolence) in personal existence.

When, then, one sees through the sociological view of the creation and annihilation of man as the unjust inequality and just equality of the substantial-contingent-present-at-hand grouping as universalizing of man as being persons (violence), he envisions a universalizing of man in grouping him in such a way that the just inequality of persons is a being-free to be-in-one-another existentially in their own care in such a way that they are individualized and grouped most appropriately according to their own most essential ways of being themselves essentially in themselves and each other personally (nonviolently).

What personal (both anthropological and sociological) potential is essentially, then, is persons own ways of being themselves essentially in themselves and each other in their own care in such a way that they are finding and becoming who they essentially are in themselves and each other in their own most appropriate groups of being in and with and for themselves and each other in their own care.

Sociological creation in personal existence takes place whenever this personal potential is realized; sociological annihilation in personal existence takes place whenever it is not.

possible that precisely at this point is to be located a critical factor so far overlooked as a necessary ingredient in creating social justice? Perhaps these attempts to create justice as contingently-present-at-hand to (absolute) *transcendence* have endowed themselves with values which are characteristics of those entities which have the kind of being possessed by Things and have not yet reached ontologico-anthropologico-social values.

If we attribute social value to man, then this should be conceived in terms of the kind of being he is. Personal existence does not reveal itself phenomenally to be essentially a being-contingently-present-at-hand, and so a sociology of personal existence is not most adequately so understood. To be enabled to account more adequately for justice and its creation and annihilation and its most appropriate sociological *transcendent* setting in personal existence requires a dismantling of sociology in such a way that the nature of transcendent-ontologico-anthropologic phenomenologico-sociology in personal existence as not contingent and not present-at-hand is a primary consideration.

When one objects to the too socially aloof and atheistically prideful possibility that persons are sociologically created and annihilated from their own always already being-in their own creation and annihilation as being personally noncontingently-self-subsistent, he is still viewing them from the perspective of personal existence's being contingently-present-at-hand as a certainty which is obvious from what everyone sees and knows to be a contingency to birth and death from which persons are sociologically contingent to each other. From this perspective, noncontingent-self-subsistent personal sociological creation and annihilation certainly appears to be impossible since it does not account for the sociological *transcendence* obviously occurring among persons. What this view still overlooks is *nonsubstantial* existential being-in one's own *care* in one's own personal existence as not being contingently-present-at-hand.

Metalogical prophecy begins here by introducing the possibility that sociological *transcendence* is grounded essentially in persons being-in themselves and each other *transcendently* in their own *care*, rather than *transcendently* being-among each other as contingently-present-at-hand. In the personal existentiality of personal existence, one is lost (annihilated) or found (created) in his own ways of being himself essentially in his own *care*. As such, persons are always already at the same time (ecstatically) *transcendently* in one another existentially in the creation and creating and annihilation and annihilating of themselves in their own ways of being themselves in themselves and each other *transcendently* in their own *care*.

Whereas attempts to find human existence to be substantially present-at-hand as contingent continually face irresolvable problems of where the Reality is and where the connections are in the dualisms of the objectivity-subjectivity and Ideality-Reality and physical-metaphysical and imminent-transcendent and one-two-many aspects of Reality, they are no longer problems whenever the manifestation of the reality of persons existence in the existentiality of their own *care* in themselves and each other is envisioned, since personal existence essentially is metalogically in its own *care* as a nonsubstantial noncontingent personal *transcending* existentiality. This is no problem since, in their own *care* in one another, persons are at the same time (ecstatically) both in and *transcending* themselves and each other. Whereas, in the substantiality of that which is contingently-present-at-hand, it seems likely that something must be either *transcendent* or imminent, in the existentiality in persons own personal *care* in themselves and each other, this either or is not binding in the essentially metalogical nonsubstantial non-contingent non-present-at-hand world of *care*. In *care*, one is both in himself and in each other *transcendingly* at the same time (ecstatically).

Persons *are* in-creation in one another *transcendingly* in the existentiality of their own ways of being themselves essentially. As such, they create and are creating and annihilate and are annihilating themselves and each other *transcendingly* in their own ways of being themselves essentially. They are creating themselves and each other existentially whenever they find themselves, and *are* themselves existentially in their own ways of being themselves essentially in themselves and each other in their own *care*. They are annihilating themselves and each other existentially whenever they lose themselves and are not themselves essentially in their own ways of being themselves essentially in themselves and each other in their own *care*. When they lose themselves and so annihilate themselves, they tend toward asking themselves what The Self is. The Self is *not* (a) what it is. A person is himself essentially only in his own ways of being himself in himself and others essentially in his (their) own *care*.

The socio-ontological confusion regarding the sociological nature of personal existence and the sociological creation and annihilation of man arises here from the difficulty of envisioning the delicate yet critical distinction between the personal existential being-in persons in themselves and each other in their own ways of being themselves essentially in their own *care* on the one hand, and the contingent-present-

the-world-personally already. In its very possibility, this having a relationship with one another is founded upon the existential-essential state of being-in. Because persons are essentially being-in-personally, they can discover, encounter, and know themselves and each other existentially (which is existentiality), and thus have a relationship with each other in the world.

The ontological foundations of this being-in-one-another-personally-in-the-world is the primordially concomitant oneness and twoness and manyness of personhood in worldhood. Traditional approaches to the problems of monism, dualism, and pluralism have attempted to make too exclusive an attempt to separate them and then consider one or the other to be more real and more essential in defining and characterizing reality to facilitate an adequate understanding of reality. This is not to say that a subjective-objective dualism is not the most feasible approach to a scientific (physics-chemistry) way of being and solution of certain practical problems. It is not, however, sufficiently primordial for an adequate understanding of personhood in worldhood. The attempt to transfer this substance-oriented scientific subject-object dualism to understand personhood does not allow for the primordial nonsubstantial oneness, twoness, and manyness of personhood in worldhood. This primordial nonsubstantially concomitant oneness, twoness, and manyness of personhood in worldhood is grounded rather in the nonsubstantial resolute care in which persons essentially are, in whose ground there is no dualistic separation of subject-object like that which appears in the spatial-temporal-substantial world that is present-at-hand.

Each person is with and in one another in the resolute care of his own temporalizing existence in such a way that care in one another is at the same time one, two, and many. Care is that in which persons are both open and bright and clear, in and for themselves and each other. Only by this clearness, brightness, and openness is any illuminating, any awareness, seeing, or having possible. Being with and in each other in the world is essentially care. Care is not simply an isolated attitude of the I toward itself. Care for and in and with oneself and others is ontologically and always being-already-in-and-alongside-and-ahead-of-and-outside-of-onself-and-others-in-and-for-themselves-personally in such a way that it is possible for each person to have factual attitudes and be in factual situations of willing and wishing, urge and addiction, concern and solicitude, possibilities and potentialities, circumspective deliberation, resolute anticipation of ends, understanding, states of mind, and discourse with each other. All of these attitudes and situations presuppose care.

A person, then, is not and never is a mere urge to which other kinds of controlling or guiding behavior are added from time to time; rather, he is always care already. Persons are themselves in their own ways of being-in-and-with-and-for-one-another-personally-in-the-world, always being-already-in-and-along side-and-ahead-of and outside-of themselves and each other.

Essence 'In' Existence

Speculation and Phenomenology

Understanding the nature of essence-in-personal-existence is perpetually hampered by confusion in assessing the most appropriate relationships between and circumstances of application of abstract speculation and concrete phenomenal personal-being-in-the-world. Abstract philosophical speculation is a complex analysis grounded in the drive to identify and characterize essence and existence by precisely distinguishing between them. This form of philosophical analysis is in turn grounded in the intense striving for epistemological certitude through the establishing of universal categories for understanding, on which dependable, unchanging, certain, even absolute analyses of the meaning and significance of the cosmos might be based and made publicly understandable and demonstrable. This abstract philosophical speculation is most efficiently facilitated by being carried out of an ontology in which being-in is a being-in of a spatial (substantial) in-one-anotherness of things present-at-hand (substantiality). This premise, however, remains at least for the most part undisclosed in traditional ontology.

Traditional ontological speculation is also grounded in a mode of temporality which considers the essence of time in terms of a regular and predictable succession of events, i.e., objective time. This premise also remains undisclosed in traditional ontology. This form of temporal speculation is founded in the powerful human urge to establish origins, which in turn is closely linked with the desire to establish causal connections, which are both grounded in the objectively oriented first impressions of everyday living. Grounding an understanding of the cosmos in traditional spatial and temporal categories is at the same time an efficient mode for explaining motion and change, and consequently human freedom. Motion is sometimes said here to be the factor which distinguishes the realm of existence from that of essence. Early modern attempts at a reconciliation here by proposing that existence is the being of essence and that therefore existence can be called essential being are still grounded in this spatio-temporal cosmology. Freedom, values, properties, and qualities, in this cosmology, are said to be

essentially bound up with the succession of temporal events in a present-at-hand spatial dimension.

Essence as a way of being in personal existence, however, is a way of being in which essence is in existence. Neither the that-it-is nor the what-it-is of essence- in -existence are to be best understood on the speculative basis of grounding this understanding in traditional spatio-temporal modes of explanation in which they are developed from speculations of cosmological origins and causal connections. To do so is to subsume persons under cosmology. This mode of reconciliation is inevitably fraught with the difficulties which appear in attempts at reconciling heterogeneous elements. Essence shows itself in existence. A formula proposing to show either that essence precedes existence or more recently that existence precedes essence attempts to show the significance of human existence on grounds contrary to and basically irreconcilable with what actually shows itself. These kinds of dualistic explanatory modes of fracturing human existence are never able appropriately to locate the connections necessary to see it adequately in its own ways of oneness, twoness, and manyness.

Significance and Freedom

Essence-in-existence is always the characteristic ways that persons-are-in-one-another. Its oneness and universality is in its always being-in-each-other-personally. Its twoness is in its being-in-each-other. Its manyness is in the essential difference of the way which each person essentially is in his existence in being with and in each other.

The significance and freedom of each person is in the ways in which they are essentially- in -each-other-in-their-existence as are also the significance of his values and qualities.

A Myth of Painters

The significance and freedom of personal-being- in -one-another-essentially may be expressed mythically.

All persons are painters.

Their artistry is characterized by more and more artistic maturity.

In the maturation of artistry we find that:

persons are always painting;

no two paintings are ever exactly the same; and

each painting of every artist is always characteristically his own,

may always be so identified, and always represents himself showing himself essentially-in-his-existence.

The Meaning of God-in-the-World

Abstract speculation has defined God as completely actualized potential, as being-itself, as unconditioned being. It is said that the being of God cannot be understood as the existence of a being alongside or above others. God is not *a* being, for if he were he would be subject to the categories of finitude, especially to space and substance. Even superlatives applied to God, it is said, place him on the level of other beings. For some, God is the answer to the question implied in man's finitude, and also that which concerns man ultimately (Tillich). This does not mean that first there is a being called God and then the demand that man should be ultimately concerned about him. It means that whatever concerns a man ultimately becomes God for him. The attempt at reconciling transcendence and imminence here is made by proposing that on the one hand it is impossible to be concerned about something which cannot be encountered concretely, and on the other hand ultimate concern must transcend every preliminary finite and concrete concern. This, it is said, is the inescapable inner tension in the idea of God.

These speculations do not adequately account for either the objective correlates or the subjective correlates or for the transcending-subjectivity-objectivity-of-God-and-men- in -existence. The project of determining the meaning of this existence is inevitably frustrated when founded upon the locating of God as he is in himself, and then men as they are in themselves, and then the relationship between the two. This frustration is basically the same as that of the perennial philosophical attempt to conceive the subjectivity and objectivity of man adequately in an analysis pursued by an attempt to separate the two distinctively.

The paradoxical answer to this frustration is that God is not as he is in himself, and neither are men nor is

CHAPTER 10 – Prophetic Sociology

When metalogical prophecy speaks ontologically and anthropologically of a person's noncontingent-self-subsistent certain possibility in personal existence of creating and annihilating himself as to who he is in his own ways of being himself essentially from his own always already ecstatically being-in his own creation and annihilation, it sounds as though this were necessarily an advocating of an-absolute-self-sufficient-self-subsistent-nontranscendent individuality which as such ought to be criticized as too susceptible to the intuited frailties of epistemological solipsism and idolatrous-atheistic-theological pride and personally destructive antisocial aloofness. And what seems simpler, for example, than to understand the sociology of the creativity of justice as something which of necessity *transcends* noncontingent-self-subsistent personal existence so that the distortions in the idiosyncrasies of one's antisocial aloofness and personal pride may be overcome to the welfare (salvation) of both society and the individual himself?

For practical everyday sociology, the power of creating justice is the proper divine-human coordination of practical everyday events in the Reality of the everyday world through the proper practical means. Everyday men sense their sociological relationships with one another to be to some extent inappropriate and inauthentic. Historically, men have been known to create social injustice by engaging themselves in a course of conquest and annihilation in pursuing what to them were their own best creative interests. Those thus conquered and annihilated have hoped for and sought the overthrow of their conquerors to restore and create what to them were conditions of peace and social justice previously violated. Practical (and Divinely revealed) laws deemed sufficient for the implementation of creating justice if only men would live them are the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule. These practical (and Divinely revealed) laws (somehow) *transcend* individual, and to some extent social, lives to which these lives must conform to create social justice. And yet human history seems to show approximately the same old uneven ratio of success and failure in the creation and annihilation of justice, presumably because men will not conform.

For Idealism (and in a modified form for Hellenistic Christianity), the moving power behind the creation of justice is Ideal Justice. Hellenistic philosophical Idealism, for example, sees the danger of sophism, i.e., ethical relativism, lurking behind and periodically coming to the fore in the annihilation of justice in practical everyday efforts to create social justice. Somehow, practical everyday laws are not founded and expounded securely enough to overcome the destructive chaos of ethical relativism. Situations inevitably occur which are not quite covered by the established laws. In seeking a more secure foundation upon which social justice might be created, Hellenistic Idealism discovers logical(ly) absolute Ideal forms of truth, beauty, and justice which *transcend* everyday life. And these absolute forms are susceptible to philosophical perception and subsequent disbursal thereby to mankind in creating justice. These absolute Ideal forms of truth, beauty, and justice have a common denominator of harmony (harmonics) and balance. Justice is created by discovering the harmony inherent in absolute justice and bringing life individually and socially into conformity with it. Failure in creating justice in human history is presumably due to lack of sufficient philosophical perception and disbursal.

For Hellenistic Christianity, justice is a practical Ideal-Divine production. This production combines practicality and Idealism by grounding the laws securely in either Ideal-Divine or Divine-Ideal *transcendence*. Either God is Truth or Truth is God as absolute dispenser (Creator) of absolute justice. Justice is created by bringing life individually and collectively (socially) into conformity with the absolute Truth of absolute Divine Justice. Failure in establishing justice in human history (its annihilation) is temporary, whose explanation is problematical, especially in the context of the problem of evil and the Hellenistic-logical descriptions and analyses of God in the tradition.

Each of these ways of viewing the creation and annihilation of justice see something (absolute) *transcending* (a person's) human existence and see (a person's) human existence as that (something) which must conform as contingent to this *transcendence* (absolute) as prerequisite to its being possible. And so justice in personal existence is taken to be created contingent to that Reality outside of personal (a person's) existence which makes it possible.

These sociological views, however, have not yet adequately accounted for the nature of personal existence itself in terms of an ontologico-anthropologico-phenomenology of personal existence itself as a factor in considering the sociological nature of personal existence, including, for example, the question of the nature of the creation of justice in personal existence. That is, implicit in each of these sociological views is the presumption usually inadvertently that personal (including a person's) existence and the sociology of personal existence is contingently-present-at-hand, viz., is what it is. But is it not

Even though one's moods and experiences seem only to be fleeting or cumulative or changing experiences out of the past which (somehow) color one's psychical condition, and as such seem to be contingent to past events (including birth), in their *constant* changing personal existence they somehow maintain themselves throughout with some sort of selfsameness in one's own personal care. Whenever-wherever-however a person exists, he does so in such a way that his not-yet and his now and his having been in his existing as himself in his own ways of being himself essentially belong to him and as such are his certain possibilities in and with and for his own creation and annihilation of himself in his own existence in his own care. The togetherness, then, in one's own personal existence is not a presence-at-hand contingent to his birth and death, and his creation and annihilation is not essentially constituted by a continuing piecing-on or piecing-off of something which somehow and somewhere and somewhen determine his personal existence to be one which is contingently-present-at-hand.

A person does not essentially exist and is not created and annihilated as the sum of the momentary actualities of experiences which come along and successively disappear. Being-in his own creation and annihilation, he exists in the creation and annihilation of who he himself is in his own ways of being himself essentially in his own care. A person exists essentially as his own connectedness of life in his own care. A person is certainly his own possibilities of creating and annihilating himself. As such, it is possible for a person to pull himself together from the annihilation of the dispersion and disconnectedness of being lost to himself in such a way that he may comport himself toward himself creatively in creating himself from his own being-in creation in bringing himself to himself so that more and more he becomes his own ways of being himself essentially in his own care.

When his heritage is thus created from being-in his own creation, his birth is caught up into his existence in coming to his own certain possibilities in his existence and he is free to create and be himself in his own ways of being himself essentially, and is free from trying to create the meaning and significance of his personal existence on the basis of a birth (and death) which was (and will be) contingently-present-at-hand. He, then, is created and creating himself from his own care and not essentially from fleeting or changing or cumulative moods and experiences out of a past (including birth) to which he is contingent as present-at-hand.

The ontologico-anthropological confusion so prominent in human history at this point through men's attempts to understand the nature and meanings and significance of human existence as contingently-present-at-hand leads men to reject and overlook and deny their own self-subsistent self-sufficiency here on the grounds of the *necessity* of overcoming their destructive pride by admitting themselves to be certainly and necessarily contingent beings. Though in the ontologico-anthropological confusion in human history this seems to be advisable, one's own self-subsistent personal being here does not manifest itself to be essentially a self-subsistence which, as such, is a certain -contingent-present-at-hand self-sufficiency. It is rather a self-sufficiency in the possibilities in one's own care in which a person is his own possibility of being himself essentially. When it is lost or one takes away the possibility of personal-self-subsistence as a means of laying the groundwork for the creation of man, what he has done is to lay the foundation for the contingent-present-at-hand creation of man which turns out to be really a spiritual annihilation in which man has lost the possibilities of the creation and creating of who he essentially is even though they are still here. For man as personal possibility in care cannot ultimately be created out of or annihilated into being contingently-present-at-hand since there is no personal possibility in that (what) which is contingently-present-at-hand. Personal possibility certainly exists only in one's own care, and is certainly revealed whenever one's own existence is an issue in and for himself. The creation and annihilation of man can only be accomplished out of and into as being-in one's own care.

The attempt to overcome human pride through the humbling of man by taking him to be essentially nothing, and only something as he becomes Real at any time that his possibilities are made certain by becoming contingent to some Reality as present-at-hand, establishes a false humility which overlooks and loses the possibilities of the creation of personal existence which are really here in one's own care in one's own personal self-subsistence.

the relationship between the two. God and men are transcending-subjectivity-objectivity-in-each-other in their existence. Only when grounded in this being-in-each-other can the meaning of God-in-the-world approach an adequate understanding.

The directionality of being-in-the-world of God and men is toward the-essential-being-of-God-and-men-in-and-with-each-other-in-existence. In this directionality, *the relationship* of God and men is miraculously creative. In this miraculous creativity is the bringing forth of the essence of God and men in their existence. The essence of God and men is their own always characteristic ways of being in each other in their existence. These ways of being are always represented in existence in their ways of seeing, hearing, speaking, responding, self-perceiving, i.e., in painting. The essence of God and men in their own always characteristic ways of being in each other in their existence is the primordial care of creativity, comfort, negotiation, mystery, evil, discipline, test, penetration, destruction, sacrifice, reconciliation, redemption, blessing, cursing, marriage, divorce, justice, mercy, passion, love, hate, etc.

Response 'In' Personal Existence

In naive objectivity, response is seen only as reaction to sensory stimuli. In slightly more advanced conceptions, to respond is to show sensitiveness to stimulus by change of behavior. In somewhat more sophistication, it is paralleled with, but seen to be more adequate than, Descartes' *Cogito, ergo sum* as *Respondeo, ergo sum* (I respond, therefore I am). This view holds that man comes into being by an act of response; his evolution consists of interrelated and complicated acts of response; his sense organs are formed in response to, and as receptacles of, very specific stimuli and would be very different in a world in which other stimuli prevailed. In still more sophistication is sensed a need to account for freedom, sometimes by simply asserting that, though determined by stimuli, we are free in the manner in which we respond and are at liberty not to respond at all, except perhaps in the sphere of merely mechanical reaction, and at other times by attempting to further ground this free manner of responding in some form of chance (indeterminism).

These ways of viewing response in personal existence are grounded in some form of objectivity-subjectivity and modes of spatio-temporality which consider the essence of personal time in terms of a regular and predictable succession of events and the essence of personal space as a being-alongside-each-other of entities, which are founded in the powerful human urges to establish origins and causal connections. They suffer the inevitable defects of all other subjective-objective dichotomies, i.e., being able to discover and locate precisely the exact connections and lines of demarcation of the subjective and objective. They are not yet grounded in the more primordial transcending-subjectivity-objectivity of personal existence.

In this ground, response is disclosed as the mode of seeing, hearing, and speaking of the transcending-subjective-objective-personal-being-in-one-another of God and men. In this mode of existence, their essential ways of being emerge in the miracle of creation. In this miracle, persons are gradually more and more sensitive of and responsive to themselves and each other essentially in their existence, which characteristically involves them in judging, understanding, concern, peace, conciliation and reconciliation, marriage, friendship, love, fruitful compromise, acceptance, curiosity, surprise, anguish, distrust, disgust, debate, war, strife, suspicion, hatred, contempt, apathy, argumentation, etc.

Self-Perception 'In' Personal Existence

Certain forms of modern thought have been led to deny the existence of self in their reacting against naive objectivity and philosophical subjectivity. Others have usually presumed self to be something present-at-hand. Apprehensiveness about the discovering of this self gets its nourishment from the assumption that self has the kind of being which belongs to something present-at-hand, even if one is far from attributing to it the solidarity of corporeality which has never been positively located. A person's selfhood is his way of existing and not an entity present-at-hand.

At the same time, self-perception has been in a state of confusion. Either the possibility of self-perception has been denied or it has been pursued on the basis of perception of things present-at-hand. Ontologically, a person is a different way of being than things present-at-hand. His subsistence is not based on the substantiality of a substance but on the Self-subsistence of the existing self, whose being is care. Since the essence of the I-hood and selfhood of each person is in his existence, and if conceived adequately must be conceived existentially, then, to disclose the essence of self-perception in personal existence, the phenomena of selfhood need to be seen existentially as phenomena in care. One's self is always already in care and must be disclosed (perceived) therein.

There is a certain constancy in this disclosure. It is not the constancy of substances present-at-hand but

is rather that of being-in-care. In terms of care, the constancy of the self, rather than the supposed persistence of a subject or an object even if conceived of as far from the solidarity of corporeality gets clarified existentially. Care is the ontological constitution of a person's self-constancy. Since the ontological structure of a person as himself centers in the self-subsistence of existence in care, these phenomena are clarified in the disclosure of one's existence in care.

Self-perception in personal existence is disclosed in care as the voice of conscience. Here conscience refers primordially to the existential foundations of personal existence more than some phenomena of social conditioning and is ontologically prior to any description and classification of these experiences of conscience. The demand that an inductive empirical proof should be given for the factuality of conscience and for the legitimacy of its voice has not yet reached beyond the confusing subjective-objective correlates of the transcending-subjective-objective grounding of these correlates in the more primordial voice of conscience disclosed in care in personal existence.

In this disclosure of care, neither vocal utterance nor hearing is essential. The voice is rather one's own essential ways of being emerging in his personal existence. The voice of conscience here asserts nothing like the giving of information factually. In this calling, one's own self is essentially brought to himself in his own existence. This arises existentially in a person's being in care in which this essential-existential calling and listening of each person is in his own existence which is a personally-being-of-God-and-men-in-and-with-themselves-and-each-other-essentially in their existence.

Self-perception in personal existence is the voice of conscience, i.e., the disclosure of each person's essential ways of being in his existence.

Potential and 'Not-ness' in Existence

Like stimulus and response and like self-perception, it is usual to pursue the meaning of potential and not-ness in existence on the basis of things present-at-hand. In the being-of-persons-in-the-transcending-subjectivity-objectivity in personal-existence, the not-being is not a present-at-hand-not-being of a missing or not-yet object or subject but is a personal not-being. This not-ness of the potentiality of being persons is one in which every person is one who always stands in one possibility or another; and who as such is at the same time not other possibilities. This not-being is at the same time always a not-yet-being what one becomes.

The temporality and spatiality of the potentiality of not-being-other-possibilities and not yet being what one becomes in personal existence are existential in their essence. Potentiality in existence is the essentiality of persons' ways of always being themselves in God and each other.

In a person's own ways of being himself essentially in his existence, what is essential is what is always his own characteristic ways of being himself. In the existential temporality and spatiality of one's own existence, his potential and not-ness are primordially in care, which is care for and in and with oneself and others always being-already-in-and-alongside-and-ahead-of-and-outside-of and toward himself-and-others-in-and-for-themselves-personally in such a way that his being and becoming himself essentially in his existence are his potentiality and not-ness but not as a present-at-hand-not-being of a missing or not-yet subject or object.

The ground-ness of potentiality shows itself existentially in the emerging of a person's essential ways of being in the self-subsistence of his existence in care. There is a certain constancy in this self-subsistence which is a person's self-constancy. This self-subsistent constancy of the potentiality of each person's ways of being himself essentially in the personal-being-of-God-and-men-in-and-with-themselves-and-each-other-essentially-in-their-existence has been overlooked, misunderstood, doubted, and discarded in the striving for a philosophical and Christian metaphysical ground for personal existence as a solution to the problems of uncovering the nature of meaning and significance in human existence. The inevitable failure of attempts to demonstrate the ground of the subsistence of personal potentiality metaphysically is a futility of seeking something or nothing or God or the cosmos or the Cartesian subject of persons in some sort of *absolute beyond themselves*. These historically continuous and yet inevitable failures arise in the overlooking of the personal-being-in-one-another-of-God-and-men which is what actually shows itself as the ground-in personal existence in its meaning and significance. The sign of the futility of these failures is the impossibility of locating the connection between both sides of these substantialistic and nihilistic dualisms, which are metaphysical fracturing of personal existence along dualistic lines which does not actually show itself to be split so precisely this way.

This self-subsistent grounding of personal potentiality is not an elimination or diminishing of the meaning and significance of something or nothing or God or cosmos or subject in personal existence, but is rather an uncovering of their being-in-one-another-in-existence, which is the

certainly sees at birth and death either physically or metaphysically they are seen to be (presumably [somehow] absolutely-totally) contingently-present-at-hand events. When, then, one comes to the problem (the mystery) of what human existence is, he ordinarily concludes on the basis of having fulfilled the *necessary* prerequisite of finding out and knowing that what birth and death certainly are are contingently-present-at-hand events that what personal existence is is then also a certainly contingent-present-at-hand event. There is, however, a delicate yet critical distinction between certainty as contingently-present-at-hand and certainty in personal existence. We cannot adequately carry through an investigation ontologically of the ways personal existence is (are) until this distinction is clarified. One may *know about* the certainty of birth and death without being certain of birth and death in the sense of thus authentically understanding their meanings and significance and that of the personal existence which (who) stretches along between them.

The meanings in and significance of personal existence are not yet adequately manifest ontologically when one attempts to discover and understand the nature of himself and his personal existence from his past and from his future by a simple tracing of a series of contingently-present-at-hand past (birth) and future (death) events which now have culminated or are culminating in a contingently-present-at-hand finding-himself. In the face of the presumed *necessity* of finding out and knowing that birth and death certainly are (were-will be) what one sees them to be as contingently-present-at-hand events and so takes himself to exist as contingently present-at-hand, persons flee from and overlook whether inadvertently or not possibilities in personal existence which are not contingent to the certainty that birth and death are (were-will be) certainly present-at-hand events.

Rather than taking its ontological clues from that which one sees as most natural and closest, viz., personal existence as a contingency to a present-at-hand birth and death, metalogical postclassical prophecy finds its ontological clues to the meanings in and significance of personal existence in personal existence itself, and in so doing discovers that being-personal becomes most intelligible whenever its character is found in itself. So its envisioning of the most appropriate ways of interpreting the meanings in and significance of personal existence is to start from personal existence itself as to what (who) it manifests itself to be essentially. It envisions the modest possibility of seeing something of real meanings in and the significance of personal existence on the basis of seeing something of who persons are in their own essential ways of being themselves essentially without the presently impossible *necessity* of first having to understand (absolutely-totally) what birth and death are (were, will be).

To what extent are the meanings and significance of (in) personal existence accounted for or overlooked when the creation (birth) and annihilation (death) and existence (life) of man are taken to be certain as contingently-present-at-hand? When the phenomena of the who-he-is-essentially of personal existence manifest themselves, they do not do so as a revelation of something which is a present-at-hand certainty contingent to a present-at-hand birth and death, but do so as personal possibilities (certainties). When, then, one takes who-he-himself-essentially-is to be the primordial ontological clue as to the nature of his own personal existence and so starts from himself as an essentially noncontingent personal entity in an investigation of the meanings in and significance of (his own) personal existence, it turns out to be a manifestation of an essentially personal self-subsistent existence whose characteristics certify it to be personally self-subsistent in its possibilities as certainly one's own in one's own care.

So whenever one finds himself in his personal existence, he is always in some state-of-mind (mood) or other in his own care. But what is the ontologico-temporal constitution of being-in-a-mood and how is it made visible? While moods are ontically well-known to us, their meanings and significance are not properly recognized ontologically when regarded solely as fleeting or cumulative experiences out of the past which (somehow) color one's psychical condition. Anything which is observed as turning up and disappearing in a fleeting or even cumulative manner nevertheless does so out of the primordial mood-care constancy in one's own personal existence without whose background they could not do so. Ontologically, a mood is one or another of the facets of care which are manifest whenever-whenever-however personal existence is here (*Dasein*). Always-being-in-a-mood is an ontologico-temporal manifestation in a person's continually being-brought-back-and-forth-to-and-from-himself as a noncontingent possibility who is certainly really here personally and who as such may be brought face-to-face with and in and to himself in such a way that who he himself essentially is in his own ways of being himself may thus be created (be-in-creation) (found) or annihilated (lost) from who he himself essentially is.

CHAPTER 9 – Prophetic Anthropology

Anthropology, whether it is generally religious or specifically Christian or not, more or less understands human existence to be that existence which exists as such as one of those events which came to be at birth and which will be no longer at death ; or in other words, that human event which is created and annihilated . This understanding of human existence and its creation (birth) and annihilation (death) is based upon what seems to be an obvious subjective-objective came into being and exists and will be no longer of subjective-objective persons in a simple past, present, and future.

Taken strictly, there is a certainty that each person was born and will die . For persons to presume an equivalence which they understand whether in an everyday or a metaphysical way between this birth and death and the creation and annihilation of man is the most natural way of comporting themselves toward themselves. But the certainty that each person was born and will die is neither decisive nor adequate to understand the meanings and significance of (in) the creation and annihilation of (in) man unless and until its implications are clarified in terms of an ontological anthropology of (in) personal existence.

When persons are said simply to be created as was born and annihilated as will die , both the everyday and the metaphysical implications of these expressions contribute to a critical anthropological confusion pertaining to the nature of creation and annihilation in personal existence.

Creation (birth) and annihilation (death) are taken to be those events which determine that (whether or not) persons exist and what they are. When it is said that there is a certainty that each person was born and as such exists and will die , what is its meaning and significance and what is its basis?

The saying that birth and death and human existence are certain is formulated from a point of view from which, for example, the sciences of biology, physiology, anatomy, and anthropology arise. Such investigations take place in that domain of existence which we know as the ontical world of animals, plants, geology, and mankind. In other words, they take place from the point of view of investigating that which is present-at-hand. That which is present-at-hand lends itself well to the solution of problems generated from questions of what it is . When, then, it is said that birth (creation) and death (annihilation) are certain , this certainty and the understanding of birth (creation) and death (annihilation) on the basis of this certainty are grounded in an understanding of personal existence as present-at-hand. So, then, the nature of personal existence as grounded in this creation and annihilation is taken to be present-at-hand, whether inadvertently or not. The existence of that which is present-at-hand can be and, possibly, most appropriately so investigated on the basis of those certainties which are present-at-hand. In such an investigation certainty supersedes possibility , both ontically and ontologically.

Implicit in that (and what) which is present-at-hand is a contingency of whatever is present-at-hand to something else present-at-hand. When the birth and death of persons are taken to be certain , they are taken to be so as contingently-present-at-hand and so their creation and existence and annihilation are taken to be contingently-present-at-hand. As such, their existence is taken to be a-what-it-is whose essential Reality to which they are contingent is outside of themselves (as another what-it-is), i.e., it is not really who he-is as a personal self-subsistent existence . When one presumes personal existence to be contingently present-at-hand, then it is natural to presume that it is contingent to birth and death and as such must be (was) created as contingently-present-at-hand to exist (subsist). The creation of personal existence , then, is taken to be that event whereby a person comes (came) to be enabled to exist (subsist) as being contingently-present-at-hand as was born .

But why is it that this interpretation of the nature of human existence has so dominated how persons comport themselves toward themselves as existing as human beings ? In being lost in the fallenness in human existence, there is a powerful impulse whether inadvertent or not to overcome this being lost in one great stride (impatiently). This powerful impulse is toward the *necessity* of interpreting the nature of personal existence by finding out and knowing (presumably [somehow] absolutely-totally)

what birth and death certainly are (were-will be). It is presumed that until one knows (presumably [somehow] absolutely-totally) what birth and death certainly are one cannot know what human existence is. One then proceeds in the most natural way to know whether metaphysically or in an every day way what birth and death are on the basis of what one sees them to be.

When birth and death are observed and understood on the basis of what one

relationality that is actually disclosed in personal existence. In this disclosure, self-subsistence is not a substantial self-subsistence but is rather persons own essential ways of always being themselves personally in one another and God in existence in care.

‘Being-In’ Truth and Value

Substance philosophy has traditionally attempted to solve the problem of the nature of truth factually by theories of correspondence and coherence and pragmatism. The problems substantially insoluble of these partial and dualistic approaches are seen in their partiality in the transcendence of being-in truth personally.

Persons-are-in-truth-in-one-another and entities, from which factual truth arises. Being-in truth is a personal way of being which is primordial true . The essential character of being-in truth personally is existential; that is, it is persons own ways of being themselves essentially in one another in their existence. In this being-in truth, persons own ways of being themselves in each other are not essentially comparable with one another and entities in a truth relationality and in a value hierarchy in which one s own way of being himself essentially is more valuable or more true than another s. These comparisons arise existentially in two ways.

When this hierarchically noncomparable relationally of persons own ways of being themselves essentially in each other and in entities remains undisclosed, the directionality of this veiling of this essential relationality tends to move toward factual comparisons and hierarchies of value not grounded in their own essential ways of being themselves. When one moves in this direction, one s factual biases which arise tend to move away from essential personal value and truth, having lost one s bearings in the veiling of one s own essential ways of being-in his truth.

When the hierarchically noncomparable relationality of persons own ways of being themselves essentially in each other and in entities is disclosed, existential comparisons still arise. These existential comparisons in value hierarchies and truth relationality emerge when some ways of being-in-one-another-and-entities-personally are disclosed which are more adequate or valuable or compatible in some circumstances than others. In the difficulties involved in the unveiling of these movements, however, they still tend more and more to an emphasis upon truth as scientific fact to the exclusion of personally being-in truth.

In personally being-in truth, one s own essential biases are essentially true , whereas factual biases tend to move away from one s own essential ways of being-in his truth.

PART II – The Prophecy of Elijah, Isaiah, and Heidegger

becoming himself essentially in his existence are his potentiality and not-ness but not as a contingently-present-at-hand-not-being of a missing or not yet subject or object which was created as a was-brought contingently-as-present-at-hand-into-being .

A person being-brought face to face with and to and in and for himself as to who he essentially is and is becoming in finding-himself-there-as-to-who-he-is in the creation and creating of himself is existentially possible only because ecstatically he-is-as-having-been-and-becoming . A person in his care in his personal existence is and is in his own possibilities of being and becoming his creation and creating of himself as to who he essentially is in being and becoming himself.

Being 'Lost' and 'Found' in One's Own Creation and Annihilation

In the possibilities of being-in creation and annihilation , personal existence is essentially manifest not as a contingent-present-at-hand was brought into being (*ex nihilo*) and will be no longer (*intra nihilo*), but as a being-lost (being-losing) and a being-found (being-finding) as to who he is in his own ways of being himself essentially in his care through the constancy of his always already being in his own personal creation and creating and annihilation and annihilating. Personal existence is in the possibilities both of being lost (annihilated spiritually) and being found (being-in-creation). Personal existence is essentially one s own possibilities for being himself essentially in his own ways of being himself in his own care.

The existential creation of man is not a contingently-present-at-hand bringing into being. The existential annihilation of man is not the making of a present-at-hand-being-no-longer (nothing). Man is annihilated existentially to the extent that he is lost (being-losing) in the fallenness of the they of everydayness and in all forms of contingency. He is created existentially to the extent that he is being-found (being-finding) in his own essential ways of being-himself in himself and others personally.

In the lostness of their fallenness in the they, men have proximally and for the most part lost (are losing) the meanings and significance of their personal existence. But because persons are-there (*Dasein*) and as such are-here in their own personal existence in such a way (ontologico-essentially-existential) that they are their own personal possibilities of existing authentically (meaningfully and significantly), they may pull themselves toward their own creation meaningfully and significantly and come back to themselves as to who they essentially are in their own ways of being themselves essentially from their spiritual annihilation .

Present-at-hand possibilities are what is possible. Present-at-hand possibility is what may happen when certain circumstances occur. If they (somehow) do not occur, then it will not happen. This possibility is contingent to circumstances.

Traditionally, the question of the nature and possibility of human freedom is taken up in the context of this present-at-hand possibility. Freedom is seen here to be paradoxically both what may happen (there is a chance that it will be) and what is (becomes) a necessity (is [has been?]) determined by circumstances and is therefore not, as such, free when it happens. Traditionally, in the either-or mentality which accompanies present-at-hand world-views as dualistic, the question of human freedom is taken to be a problem, and each side of this paradox collects its adherents who then vigorously create and defend arguments as to whether or not men are free. One side proposes that men *are* free since they *are* not determined (there is a chance that it may happen), and the other side that they *are* not free since what has happened (*is* happening?) is determined as (has been?) a necessity. The problem of human freedom as a present-at-hand possibility is essentially not resolvable and must remain a paradox since personal existence is not essentially present-at-hand.

What is overlooked in the present-at-hand way of understanding the possibility of one's personal existence being created authentically secure and free is the critical distinction between the possibilities of present-at-hand creation and the possibilities in personal creation and creating. Present-at-hand possibility is what may happen when certain circumstances occur. Personal possibilities are possibilities in which (who) a person is essentially himself in his own ways of being himself essentially. Personal possibilities are possibilities, and are free essentially as being-in personal creation and creating. As such, they are essentially neither contingent nor present-at-hand.

Creating and annihilating persons, then, are not essentially contingent-present-at-hand projects.

That the personal possibilities including personal freedom and creation and annihilation in personal existence are essentially neither present-at-hand nor contingent projects is manifest in personal existence itself. That the nature of and possibilities in one's own existence *are* an issue in and for himself is a *sign* of this manifestation. That personal existence is such that the essential possibilities in its existence are an issue in and for and of itself is a *sign* both that personal possibilities are not contingently-present-at-hand (including logical) possibilities and that they are there and at the same time (ecstatically) in some ways *are* not-yet there and *are* not other possibilities. As an issue for and in and of himself, a person's possibilities *are* for and being-in his own creation and creating. As such, a person is constantly ecstatically coming and going backward and forward to and from himself in finding (*befindlichkeit*) himself as to who he essentially is in being and not-being and at the same time (ecstatically) becoming himself in his own essential ways of being and becoming himself.

Not-being in personal existence is not a contingently-present-at-hand not-being (annihilation *ex nihilo* or *intra nihilo*) of a present-at-hand subject or object. It is, rather, a notness of the potentiality in-being persons. In this notness, every person always is-there (*Dasein*) in one possibility or another and is as such at the same time (ecstatically) *not* other possibilities. He is at the same time (ecstatically) the not-yet-being possibility in who he is essentially becoming. *Creation ex nihilo* in personal existence is a bringing forth of the essential ways of being a person in his transcending-subjective-objective-(non)-contingent-potential-for-being-himself-essentially and not being other possibilities.

When personal existence is taken to be present-at-hand, the nature of the possibilities of being-personal is essentially overlooked. In this oversight is a critical confusion between present-at-hand (including logical) possibilities and personal possibilities which are not grounded in that which is contingently-present-at-hand but in care. Personal existence is, in care. In care, personal existence is the possibility of persons being-in personal relationships in and with themselves and each other in such a way that the essential possibilities of their existence are an issue in and with and for themselves, viz., are personal possibilities.

Being-In Creation and Annihilation in One's Own Care

In the essentially ecstatic existential temporality and spatiality in one's own personal existence, his potential (including not-ness) for the creation and creating of himself as who he himself essentially is in his own ways of being himself essentially is primordially in his care, which is care for and in and with oneself and others always being-already in-and-alongside-and-ahead-of-and-outside-of-and-toward himself-and-others-in-and-for-themselves-personally in such a way that his being and

CHAPTER 3 – Introduction

This title is not meant to imply that this section presumes to describe the reality of the lives of the historical persons mentioned as they are or were in and of themselves. It is rather presumed that the literary materials associated with and symbolized by these names represent definitive examples of the forms and dimensions of prophecy under consideration in the work. In the case of Elijah, the expression the canonical Elijah would also be appropriate. This phrase represents material written in the third person(s) which has achieved a form and content expressing a particular dimension of prophecy. Such a dimension may also be referred to as pre-classical, especially when seen in a perspective in which Isaiah is referred to as the first person (s) literature of classical prophecy *par excellence*. In a still wider perspective, the name Heidegger represents what is seen here to be a contemporary body of literature which shows the potential (and preliminary actuality) of reaching still another dimension of prophecy which in some sort of continuity with these other perspectives could be referred to as postclassical prophecy. It has long been recognized that the classical prophecy of the eighth to sixth centuries B.C. differed from its precursors. Its ethical dimension shows a far deeper concern for social justice than does the preclassical prophecy of its predecessors. Our concern here is to attempt to go beyond this important distinction and compare these and also this more modern form of prophecy with each other on the basis of additional categories, i.e., theology, anthropology, epistemology, etc. This essay is a general response to the general body of material associated with the three names and the references are consequently limited to a few parentheses from First and Second Kings, Isaiah, a few other Old Testament passages, and a brief bibliography of modern writers.

The Old Testament passages quoted are my own translation in correlation with the authorized version and *The New English Bible*. This title is intended to imply that prophecy is evolutionary or progressive, not, however, in the scientific but in the prophetic sense. That is, it is not evolutionary in the sense of a biological response to a physical environment, but is a spiritual response to a divine-human dimension of existence. The exact nature of this evolutionary development is complex and is not a simple consistently linear spiritual development. For instance, preclassical, classical and postclassical prophecy may exist side by side in certain circumstances. Preclassical prophecy may also persist in more or less mature forms for many consecutive generations and then not necessarily develop into either classical or post-classical prophecy. Theoretically, it would be rare, however, for classical prophecy to develop without being preceded by and developing in a more or less direct way from preclassical prophecy. More probable could be a development of postclassical prophecy from a much less direct relationship to the others. In general however one would expect preclassical prophecy to be by far the most common dimension of the three and an occasional development of one and or the other two either from it or in some sort of association with it. Historically speaking, preclassical prophecy seems to have been a relatively familiar dimension of prophecy in the ancient world, classical prophecy seems to have been a rare dimension of prophecy developing in the axial period of human history around the eighth century B.C. and postclassical prophecy seems not to have developed in the ancient world, other than its root beginnings developing in Greece a few centuries B.C. The modern world is apparently the historical scene in which all three dimensions of prophecy here considered may best be viewed together, either in terms of ancient or modern examples based especially on such definitive paradigms as Elijah, Isaiah, and Heidegger.

CHAPTER 4 – Elijah

Prophecy conceived as awareness of divine and human nature and relationships is not a dimension of human existence which can be adequately understood as a singly homogenous occurrence which is exactly or even approximately the same in every instance.

Our understanding of the nature of this prophecy is dependent upon what we can perceive of and through the nature of the exposition of the prophecy which is given to us. In contrast with some facets of postclassical prophecy, it is for the most part prelogical and nonexplanatory. A concern for detailed precision in locating and explaining each link in a cause-and-effect chain of events in existence is not manifest. It lacks much detail in terms of very extensive existential identification of the meaning and significance of the divine and human life involved in the exposition. It includes a quasi-historical setting in which certain questions regarding the significance of the religious-political situation of Israel are expressed in the form of curt prose proclamations. In contrast with Isaiah, it is a prose much more than a poetic presentation.

Prophetic Theology

Elijah expresses a situation of prophecy whose concern includes that facet of idolatry having to do with the problems of the objectivity of reality. The exact nature of these problems is not made explicit. Without explaining, a proclamation is made *that* the (objective) setting up and worshiping of the idols of Asherah and Baal is evil. The solution of the problem is simply described as the tearing down, burning, and otherwise destroying of the objects named as idols (*miphletseth*) and the accompanying groves, altars, sacred pillars, etc. The greatest heroes of the prophecy are those kings and prophets most successful in such objective destruction, even though the solution is always temporary (1 Kings 15:9-15; 2 Kings 23). Neither this prophetic solution to the problem nor this naming of the problem idolatry (*miphletseth*) with its meta-objective implications having to do with quivering, trembling, and terror gives significant indication of more than a general objective orientation to the problem. Whether the Baal question has any but this aspect or whether the proper worship of Yahweh has any objectivity is not developed. Neither is there any precision of discussion entered into regarding the differences and similarities of Baal and Yahweh nor why Baal idolatry is so attractive and consequently so difficult to deal with.

The proper identification of Yahweh as a presumed prerequisite to proper worship is only vaguely alluded to. The epistemological requirements necessary to a satisfactory divine identification and worship are only incidentally referred to in Elijah's request that Yahweh make it known *that* he is the God of Israel by a marvelous demonstration of power in which the objects of worship, i.e., the whole-offering, the wood, the stones, the earth, and the water (and the air?) are to be consumed by fire (1 Kings 18:36-37). Problems regarding the relationships between existential faith and objective signs are not entered into. Place is not given in the account for consideration of the possibilities of individual differences of worship and consequent idolatries among Yahwehists themselves.

Other matters of serious concern in other dimensions of prophecy (Jonah, Job, classical, postclassical, etc.) are not here matters which are thought-provoking. When, for example, in the face of an apparent capriciousness which in other prophetic dimensions is disturbing Elijah is told both that divine destruction is to overtake Ahab and that Ahab is to escape the disaster, he has no comment (1 Kings 21:21-29). This apparent capriciousness with overtones of apparent divine impotence are also reflected in the accounts of Ben-hadad, king of Syria, whose destruction is made a matter of divine decree but who escapes the fate and dies in bed (1 Kings 20:42). The classical poesy and the postclassical explanation and quasi-poesy of the rhythm of pride and humility do not enter into the prophecy of Elijah. There is no attempt to show the possibility of the repentance and humility of Ben-hadad as a modifying factor (1 Kings 20) in the otherwise apparent divine capriciousness and impotence. The closely related classical and postclassical problems of divine involvement in evil are obliquely pronounced (*rah* evil, adversity, affliction, calamity) but again are not thought-provoking and do not attract an explanation in preclassical prophecy. The Lord proclaims the divine bringing forth of evil on Ahab after the Naboth affair (1 Kings 21). The heavenly council sends a lying spirit to the school of prophets to entice Ahab to attack Ramoth-Gilead so that disaster might fall upon him and the divine decree against him might be fulfilled (1 Kings 22:19-23). Is this justice by retribution, and if so, how is it appropriate? What are we to understand about divine nature in conjunction with these accounts of Elijah prophecy?

That the problem of idolatry is not solely a question of simply correlating God with objects, either in a positive or a negative way, might be inferred from Elijah's prophecy, though the prophecy itself makes no more of the question than the intense proclamation made by the prophets in varying objectively oriented circumstances that the Lord himself is involved. God answers Elijah's request at Carmel by fire (1 Kings 18:24). He sends messages by the Elijah prophets to kings and people bearing particularly on those aspects of their political and religious

not a contingent and in some way less Real *part* of some dualism or another, and the possibilities of comporting himself toward his own creation and annihilation as being really his own are thereby spiritually annihilated.

Present-at-hand (dualistic) attempts to solve present-at-hand (dualistic) problems by a distinctive separation of each side of the Reality to see it as it is in and of itself (and usually to see which side is more Real) imply and promote an understanding of Reality or some part thereof as essentially contingent, which is inadequate in understanding the nature of personal existence which is not essentially contingent but is a personal being-in-oneself-and-others-and-God-in-one's-own-ways-of-being-himself-essentially. Paradoxically, God is not as he is in himself, and neither are men and their being-themselves-essentially-in-one-another are not contingent upon one another but are being-themselves-essentially-while-(ecstatically)-being-in-one-another-personally. Personal existence is essentially a transcending-subjective-objective-Ideal-Real-physical-metaphysical-(non)-contingent-being-in-one's-own-existence-personally-in-each-other. As such, persons are already always ecstatically being-in their own creation and annihilation personally in the creation and creating who they themselves are in their own ways of being themselves essentially. The meaning and significance of personally being-in-creation is lost in comporting oneself toward his creation as a present-at-hand was brought into Being as a was born. Losing this being-in creation is a spiritual annihilation.

Contingent Being-There and Not-Being in Creation and Annihilation

Simple present-at-hand temporality and spatiality lead one to comport himself toward himself as though his creation was (were) a present-at-hand birth (*ex nihilo*) as a was brought into being and his annihilation will be a present-at-hand death as a will be no longer (*intro nihilo*). Implicit in this way of comporting oneself toward his existence is the understanding that his being-there is a present-at-hand contingency to something (someone) without which he is essentially a not-being-there as a not-being-at-all. This is the most natural way for a person to understand the nature of his creation and annihilation.

But when a person comports himself toward himself in this most natural way, what he overlooks is that he himself is not essentially present-at-hand. His existence is essentially personal. In this oversight is a significant state of confusion. When a person confuses this contingent-present-at-hand not being and being-there with the existential being-there and not-being which is manifest as essentially being-in-personal existence, he is unaware of the meaning and significance of this confusion in comporting himself toward his creation and annihilation. He, then, does so in such a way that what he presumes to be a comporting himself toward his creation (birth) is rather an annihilation (spiritual) of who he himself essentially is in being-there and not-being in his personal existence. In so doing, he turns out to be essentially nothing except as he may be-there as contingent to something (someone) through whom (somehow) his Reality is (somehow) brought into being and is thereby secured (saved). But this securing of his Being Real as a contingent-present-at-hand-Real-Being-there (and the existential despair projected as a necessary conclusion of the discovery that the core of existence is Really Nothing covered up by an illusory present-at-hand supposedly secure contingency whether Ideal or Divine) shows itself to be an inauthentic security (and existential despair) in which his personal existence is not Really his own (is spiritually annihilated). What one is doing in this supposedly secure movement toward contingency is fleeing from himself. When one flees from himself in the confusion of his anxiety toward and fear of being nothing at all Really in being-himself essentially and flees toward the security (or despair of) of being something Really as being-contingent-to something (someone), this fleeing is an inauthentic creating (spiritual annihilation) of his Really Being someone.

But what is the possibility of an authentic security of a person's being real in which his personal existence is really his own and is in -creating as such?

Possibilities and Freedom in Personal Creation and Annihilation

When personal existence is taken to be present-at-hand, the possibility of one's personal existence being created authentically secure is taken to be possible (only and most feasibly) as a present-at-hand contingency. The authentically secure possibilities of personal existence implied in this contingency are present-at-hand possibilities. As a modal category of presence-at-hand, possibility is taken to signify what is *not yet* actual and what is *not at any time* necessary. It is characterized as the *merely* possible. Ontologically, it is on a lower level than actuality and necessity (and their security).

would be philosophically very unusual) taken to be the other way around.

A problem of both physical and metaphysical contingency, especially for understanding the nature of personal existence, is a being involved in a present-at-hand dualism or pluralism. The essence of this problem is the question of how one side of the dualism is connected with or participates in the Reality (the essential nature) of the other side. The problem includes the question of the nature of the Reality (reality) of each side of the dualism as it is in and of itself, and has received massive attention in the philosophical history of man but remains essentially unresolved.

Those concerned with this problem have either settled for a necessary (somehow) dualism (subject-object; physical-metaphysical) of reality (or pluralism along the same lines) or for the religio-metaphysics of a simple and essentially only monistic (one) Reality. In the latter, and sometimes the former, solution to this problem, any twoness and manyness experienced only appears to be real. This proposal has the advantage of being a metaphysical solution to the problem, but the disadvantage of thereby overlooking much that is meaningful and significant in personal existence. These understandings appear to have many practical and theoretical advantages. But for the most part persons have still not been aware of certain very delicate and yet critical distinctions that exist between these understandings of birth and death on the one hand and the creation and annihilation of man on the other. So personal existence arrives here at a juncture in its creation and annihilation in which adequate distinctions between comporting oneself authentically toward his own creation and annihilation and comporting himself toward himself as a contingency which was created as a present-at-hand was born and will be annihilated as a present-at-hand will die are critical. At this juncture, metalogical prophetic ontology sees some significance of (and, to some extent, some meanings of) understanding the creation and annihilation of man in such a way (by seeing through both everyday and metaphysical ontologies) that it is consistent with what (who) the reality is that is manifest in the personal existence which (who) he himself is and embodies.

Though there undoubtedly are contingencies in personal existence particularly in the objective and subjective correlates of personal existence yet one cannot adequately comport himself toward his creation and death as a contingency since personal existence is not essentially a contingent existence. When, then, one comports himself toward himself as being-contingent, who he himself is in his own essential ways of being-himself-in-each-other-in-divine-light is lost (spiritually annihilated), and what he presumes to be his creation as a contingent-present-at-hand entity turns out to be an annihilation (spiritual) of who he himself is essentially. What is overlooked in this being-lost (annihilated) as contingent and is prerequisite to finding himself as to who he is in his own ways of being himself essentially is the distinction in one's existence between his contingencies and his being in personal existence.

Personal existence is being-in-one-self-and-others-personally-in-one's-own-ways-of-being-himself-essentially. A basic problem of understanding the ontological situation of being-in-one-self-and-others-personally is the problem of seeing the ontological difference between this being-in and the being in of a present-at-hand-(spatial)-being-in. By present-at-hand-being-in is meant the relationship of being which is a relationship of contingency which two entities extended in space have to each other. The water as being-in the glass is contingent to the glass for this being-in. As a personal existentially, being-in-one-self-and-others-personally is not essentially the (or essentially like the) being-present-at-hand together of Things that occur. Persons are not impersonal entities side-by-side each other who then (somehow) personally come into each other as entities contingently present-at-hand. Persons are already always in-one-another (and in-entities) existentially, i.e., in terms of a personal in-ness which (who) is not essentially present-at-hand. This personal-being-in-one-self-and-others is a sameness and, at the same time (ecstatically), a difference of being in the sense of each person being-himself-in-his-own-essential-ways-of-being-himself-in-each-other as circumspectively concerned care. The world of personal existence is essentially always my concernfully (carefully) being-in and sharing-with others our personhood in care. Being-circumspectively-concernful-in-care-in-one-self-and-others is not essentially a present-at-hand being-in. So, being-with-and-in-personally is not essentially a contingency based on the occurrence together of several subjects or objects, some of whose Reality are (somehow) contingent to (and more or less Real than) others (*a priori*).

An ontological foundation of this being-in-one-another-personally-in-our-world is the primordially concomitant oneness and twoness and manyness of personal existence. Present-at-hand substantial ways of understanding Reality with their subject-object Ideal-Real dualisms are inadequate to understand the essential nature of personal existence, and do not allow for the primordial nonsubstantial oneness, twoness, and manyness of personal existence. The oneness (universality) in personal existence is persons always already (ecstatically) being-in-one-self-and-each-other-personally. The twoness in personal existence is persons being-in-each-other-in-being-themselves-essentially. The manyness is in the essential differences in the ways which each person essentially is in his existence in being with and in each other. When this ontological foundation in personal existence is overlooked, personal existence is taken to be whether inadvertently or

conduct which are portrayed as objectively observable. A theology of divine nature and intervention in human affairs is inviting here to classical and postclassical prophecy, especially as it might bear on the perplexing issues of the nature of the objectivity of idolatry and the nature of the apparent divine interest and involvement in human affairs, but is left almost wholly unattended in pre-classical prophecy.

Prophetic Anthropology

Prophetic anthropology, conceived as awareness of the meaning and significance of human personal existence, is vague in Elijah prophecy. Frequent accounts of large-scale destruction of human life are given without comment and explanation. The solution to the problem of idolatry reaches its dramatic climax and final stage in the Elijah dimension of prophecy not only in the destruction of the sacred groves, altars, idols, etc., but in the great confrontation between Elijah and the prophets of Baal in which hundreds of them are mocked by Elijah and then destroyed (1 Kings 18). Later two companies of fifty each of Ahab's messengers are summarily put to death by Elijah before the spokesman of a third company is somehow able to convince Elijah to give consideration for the value of their lives and thus avoid the calamities brought on the others (2 Kings 1). The armies of the Aramaeans under Ben-hadad are looked upon as rabble by an Israelite prophet (1 Kings 20:28). Yet, curiously, though the Aramaeans express a willingness to take the Israelites alive whether they have come for peace or for battle (1 Kings 20:20), the Israelites finally gained the upper hand and destroyed one hundred thousand Aramaean infantrymen in one day (1 Kings 20:30). Also, perplexingly, Ahab was prone to let his captured opponent Ben-hadad go free (1 Kings 20:30-43), but Elijah decreed his death.

In all of these accounts, however, there are no prophetically anthropological considerations reported of the meaning and significance of the human lives involved. Without discussion, slight suggestions of concern for life are alluded to in the cases of Elijah's healing the widow's son (1 Kings 17), Obadiah's hiding 100 prophets from Jezebel's destruction (Kings 18), Ben-hadad's willingness to preserve the lives of the Israelites (1 Kings 20:20), and Ahab's allowing Ben-hadad to live (1 Kings 20:29-43). The flight of Elijah into the wilderness and then to Mount Horeb after his confrontation with Jezebel's prophets at Camel does give a brief glimpse into material which is potentially anthropological. Elijah's fear, death wishes, and intimations of his despair are spoken of, without, however, any discussion of their nature either with regard to human nature in general or specifically in regard to the nature of Elijah and his life (1 Kings 19).

Prophetic Sociology

Elijah prophecy is preoccupied with war. Its major sociological topic is religious, political, and civil war. It does little, however, toward discussing the nature of war. The causes of war are attributed to divine retribution and also to disobedience to divine commands and forewarnings. There is no discussion of ideal societies, social relationships, etc.

The canon shows Elijah's social relationships to the religious and political institutions of his day to have been autonomous and heteronomous.

Prophetic Epistemology and Revelation

Preclassical prophecy is characterized by oracular proclamations regarding certain specific future events, primarily oracles of doom pronounced by various forms of divination. Elijah proclaimed a coming famine in the land to Ahab (1 Kings 17:1). He foretold a miraculous supply of food through the famine for his succoring widow (1 Kings 17:14). In Naboth affair, he pronounced a forthcoming disaster to Ahab: Where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, there dogs shall lick your blood (1 Kings 21:19-21; 22:34-38).

There is some conflict over the legitimacy of the activities of this divination among certain oracles and circles of oracles. When Ahaziah's messengers were on the way to inquire of Baal-zebub, the god of Ekron, whether or not he would recover from his illness, the angel of the Lord ordered Elijah to interrupt their journey and pronounce the oracle of death on Ahaziah himself. The nature of the conflict of oracles is only briefly and obliquely alluded to in the Elijah question, Is there no god in Israel, that you send to inquire of Baal-zebub the god of Ekron? (2 Kings 1:1-6). Could the prophets of Baal-zebub have pronounced the oracle? If so, why and how? If not, why not? These epistemological questions remain unasked and unanswered.

In a similar situation, Saul, when out of divine favor, seeks an oracle of his future from the woman of Endor. It is said that even though he has had a history of prophetic success, he is now unable to receive an oracle himself, either by inquiry or dreams or by Urim or by prophets (1 Samuel 28:6). In consultation, the woman of Endor is successful in calling forth the dead Samuel who then proceeds to pronounce upon Saul the oracle of doom and death

(1 Samuel 28:1-20). The question of legitimacy here is not one which is easily decided simply on the basis of concluding that the Elijah prophets are ways successful in their oracular attempts and other prophets are simply pseudo-prophets because unsuccessful. Again, epistemological problems of how and why the woman of Endor or was successful remain undiscussed.

Though Balaam refused an offer of Balak to do whatever Balaam asked (even if it were all the gold and silver in his house) for a favorable oracle, still he apparently accepted the fees for augury delivered to him by the elders of Moab and Midian (Numbers 22:7, 17-18). He then pronounced the of doom upon Balak three times upon three successive requests by resorting to divination (24:1) and seeing in a trance the vision from the Almighty (24:4).

When, then, Elijan prophecy prescribes against other prophetic circles of augury, divination, sorcery, and trafficking in ghosts and spirits (2 Kings 17:17; Deuteronomy 18:10-15), it is apparently not a denunciation of pseudo-prophecy on the epistemological grounds that the divination is not a reality of some sort or that it does not happen or that it is not at all accurate in its predictions, but is apparently denounced on other grounds, especially for association with idolatrous shrines (2 Kings 17:17). Nowhere, however, whether in those prophetic circles considered legitimate or in those where denounced, is the epistemological nature of pre-classical prophecy given much consideration.

Prophetic epistemology in Elijah prophecy is only alluded to occasionally, and then without elaboration. It is said that the word of the Lord came to Elijah (1 Kings 19:9). There is neither any description and discussion of the nature of the word of the Lord nor the nature of its reception by Elijah except to call it a calm sound or a quiet voice (1 Kings 19:9-14). The nature of Elijah himself as receiver is not described.

The widow succoring Elijah responds to the reviving of her son with the confession that she now knows for certain *that* Elijah is a man of God, and *that* the word of the Lord on his lips is truth (1 Kings 17:24). The account expresses no need in those circumstances to make further inquiry into the nature of reality represented by the language used. Reference is made to a prophetic epistemology in the great confrontation at Carmel when Elijah requests *that* Yahweh make it known *that* he is the god of Israel by a consuming fire (1 Kings 18:36-37). The people respond by confessing *that* Yahweh is God. The nature and extent of the knowledge prompting confession is not described. After the Aramaean armies succumb to the Israelites, there is the prophetic pronouncement that they have been given into the hands of the Israelites *that* they might know that Yahweh is God. Again, there is further elaboration regarding the nature and extent of such knowledge (1 Kings 20:28).

Prophetic Ontology

The question of Being does not arise in Elijah. His pre-classical precursors, however, give some indirect consideration to ontology in referring to the coming into being of things and the entrance of death into the world by proclaiming the divine creation and the fall of man. This ontological proclamation does not enter into questions of the nature of this creation and fall, and its ontological orientation is so only in a very limited sense (Genesis 1-3).

at-hand including the especially powerful impetus to consider the creation of man to be a was brought into being in a simple present-at-hand birth in a simple present-at-hand past (*ex nihilo*). Even though highly sophisticated metaphysics attempts to transcend the limitations of everyday present-at-hand world-views, it still has a present-at-hand orientation, but in terms of discovering the Ideal substantiality the essential whatness of Reality. Whether inadvertently or not, this is ultimately done by analogy to everyday presence-at-hand. In so doing, metaphysics still grounds personal existence in an ontology of a contingent being-there. Hellenistic Christianity likewise grounds personal existence in an ontology of a contingent being-there, but in so doing names God as the ontological ground upon which personal existence is essentially contingent. It also considers the creation of man to be a was brought into being in a simple present-at-hand birth in a simple present-at-hand past (*ex-nihilo*).

Though these contingent beings-there are the most natural ways of viewing the ontological grounds of personal existence, they are not the most adequate way of doing so, especially since personal existence is not essentially present at-hand and since they take their ontological clues from that reality which is closest viz., that which is present-at-hand. Then what is the essential difference between a contingent being-there and the personal being-there (*Dasein*) in the ecstatic temporality of care in personal existence? A contingent being-there is a present-at-hand was brought into being and was placed there. The essential Reality of that which is contingent is other than and outside of itself so that any contingent Reality is essentially dependent upon that to which it is contingent in such a way that its essential being-there is essentially contingent. In and of itself, it is not essentially really Real. The essential responsibility for and freedom of reality is not, then, in contingent reality but is in essential reality, upon which contingent reality is contingent. In other words, contingency is essentially being-present-at-hand. But personal existence does not show itself to be essentially present-at-hand. For example, *Dasein* is-there and as such finds himself to be and shows himself to be essentially his own possibilities. This personal being-possible is to be sharply distinguished both from logical (present-at hand) possibilities and from the contingent possibilities of something present-at-hand since they are found to be possibilities, whereas in personal existence a person finds and so understands in one way or another his own possibilities as grounded in his own being-possibility. The circularity of this argument is an evidence in its favor. Whereas circularity in a logical argument is some evidence of some logical weakness in the argument, the circularity of this personal phenomenon of one s being-there in his own possibilities essentially and finding himself there affirms the noncontingent essential personal being-there as his own possibilities which (who) he is since he (circularly) continually points to himself as finding himself (*befindlichkeit*) in and as his own possibilities whether authentically or not; i.e., he continually comes to himself. The personal existence of man is an embodiment in, and as such is a revelation in and of himself ontologically.

When, then, a person finds himself to be the creation of someone or something upon which he is contingent, he has not-yet found himself authentically as to who he himself essentially is. This contingent creation, then, is proximally and for the most part a confusing of a present-at-hand creation with the creation of a person s finding himself as to who he himself really and authentically and essentially is in himself in his own possibilities in being himself essentially. This confusion turns out to be in-reality a spiritual annihilation of himself as to who he really is as being-there himself essentially.

Contingency and Being-In Personal Creation and Annihilation

Proximally and for the most part, persons understand themselves to be a contingent-present-at-hand existence, whether or not they are aware of this understanding. They understand their birth (creation) and death (annihilation) to be a contingent-present-at-hand was born as a was brought into being (*ex nihilo*), and a will die as a being no longer (*intra nihilo*) (or as a present-at-hand being-immortal). This is the most natural way of understanding themselves and the nature of their existence. Contingency is something s (someone s) being dependent (somehow) for its (his) Reality (Being) upon some Reality (Being) outside (somehow) of itself (himself).

Being present-at-hand is contingent when, taken in a simple physical and temporal sense and especially when not accounting for the essentially ecstatic temporality in personal existence something (someone) is contingent to something (someone) else as Being (a) physical-temporal present-at-hand priority (somehow) to itself (himself). Being present-at-hand is contingent when, taken metaphysically, something (someone) as physically present-at-hand is contingent to (a) metaphysical Reality as Being (an) Ideal-essential-nontemporal (yet still present-at-hand as substantial whatness) priority (*a priori*) (somehow) to itself (himself) though it could be (though it

metaphysical present-at-hand interpretations of the nature of personal existence, usually inadvertently, and over look and confuse them with the personal nature of personal existence. The nature and significance of this confusion becomes more and more evident when it is seen that (and what and how and why) this present-at-hand comportment over looks the ecstatic temporality and the beings-there and the beings-in and the possibilities of personal creation and annihilation.

Ontology

The “Ecstatic” Temporality of Creation and Annihilation

Creation is for the most part presumed to be a bringing a person into being (the birth of a person) at some time in the past. Implicit in this understanding of the creation of man is a present-at-hand bringing into being at some present-at-hand time past. The annihilation of a person is presumed to be a being-no-longer (the death of a person) at some time in the future. Implicit in this understanding of the annihilation of man is a present-at-hand being-no-longer at some present-at-hand future time. Taken strictly, there is a certainty which is *only empirical* that each person was born and will die. These facts, however, are not decisive in understanding the meanings and significance of the temporality of the creation and annihilation of man. When one understands himself from his past and future, he does not adequately do so ontologically by a simple discovery of who he is by a simple tracing of a series of present-at-hand events which have now culminated or will culminate in a present-at-hand finding-himself.

What is decisive in understanding the temporality of the meanings and significance of the creation and annihilation of man are the ontological phenomena in the ecstatic temporality in human existence continually showing themselves in personal existence even though, in the fallenness of men into the they, they are proximally and for the most part lost and overlooked. Personal existential temporality is essentially ecstatic, from which is-derived the everyday sensation of time as only a continuous succession of present-at-hand events including present-at-hand past and present and future time. Though the apparent attractiveness of present-at-hand temporality quite effectively conceals the essentially ecstatic temporality in personal existence, it is nevertheless there. But what (*who*) is it that (*who*) is-there (*Dasein*) essentially?

The ontological structure of the personal entity who in each case I myself am centers in the self-subsistent being-there (*Dasein*) of my own personal existence in care. A person's unity and totality in the personal ecstatic temporality in his care means that, as existing, he is constantly ahead-of-himself-and-behind-himself-already-being-in-himself-as-being alongside-and-in-entities-within-a-world; i.e., he is always already having-been and being-there and becoming in the sense of *I-am-personally-having-been-myself-as-well-as being-there-and-becoming-myself* essentially. These items of care have not been and are not being pieced together cumulatively so that existential ecstatic temporality is being or has been or will be essentially put together in the course of time. The essential ecstatic temporality in personal existence is one's primordial personal being-outside-of-himself-in and-for-himself. The ontological basis of this and every aspect of personal temporality is one's *coming toward and to himself* personally as to who he himself is in his own essential ways of being himself in himself and others. Being-brought face-to-face with the that-he-is and the who-he-is of his own personal ex-is-tence is and becomes existentially possible only if personal existence, in the primordially of its very existence, constantly *is* and *is becoming as having been*.

When, then, a person's creation is taken to be or even to begin as simply a present-at-hand was born (*ex nihilo*), was brought into being, his being-lost in the fallenness of this everyday present-at-hand comportment toward his creation turns out to be rather a spiritual annihilation (a losing) of his own essential-ecstatic-temporality-in-which-he-is-able authentically to come to himself as to who he himself essentially is. In losing the ecstasy of their own personal existential temporality, then, persons lose their bearings in understanding the meanings in and significance of their own personal creation and annihilation. In the confusion of losing their bearings, that which their creation is presumed to consist of turns out to be a spiritual annihilation of themselves; which is a fleeing from themselves as to who they themselves essentially are; which is a fleeing to a comporting toward themselves as a to have been created by and at birth.

Contingency and the Personal-Being-There in Creation and Annihilation

Contingent being-there is the most natural way of viewing the ontological grounds of personal existence. It takes its ontological clues from that Reality which is closest, viz., that which is present-

CHAPTER 5 – Isaiah

In contrast with Elijah, Isaiah is in a poetical quasi-objective and quasi-explanatory exposition into an uncovering of divine-human reality beyond the simple objectivity of its nature. His prophetic poetry is the emerging into his own songs and hymns with their various movements the words of his vision of the nature of the essential rhythms and attunements and appropriations of divine-human existence in the world. He opens up in prophetic poetry that which before had been undistinguished. His standing in the open in the presence of both the divine and the human neither produces a world simply of his own imaginings nor is simply a messenger in response to other and greater powers.

Prophetic Theology

Rather than the tearing down, burning, and otherwise physical destruction of idols and their accompanying ceremonial artifices, the solution to the problem of idolatry for Isaiah is in the nature of the seeing and hearing involved.

Those

who have no confidence and trust in the work of

the Lord,

and do not see the things that he has done

[are]

dwindling away all unaware;

the nobles are starving to death,

and the common folk die of thirst. [Isaiah 5:12-13]

[Though]

their land is filled with idols [2:8]

yet the heart of the problem is not reached without realizing

that anything is an idol when

they bow down to the work of their own hands,

to what their fingers have made. [2:8]

Consequently, to solve the problem

mankind shall be brought low,

all men shall be humbled. [2:9]

Still more specifically

man's proud eyes shall be humbled,

the loftiness of men brought low,

and the Lord alone shall be exalted on that day. [2:11]

The Lord of Hosts has a day of doom waiting

for all that is proud and lofty,

for all that is high and lifted up,

Then man's pride shall be brought low,
and the loftiness of man shall be humbled,
and the Lord alone shall be exalted on that day,
while the idols shall pass away utterly. [2:12-18]

More significant than a physical destruction of idols in Carrie Nation fashion is when:

the scared oaks in which you have delighted shall fail you,
the garden shrines which you have chosen shall
disappoint you. [1:29]

Even when idols as objective constructions of men's hands are objectively present:

Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts:
the whole earth is full of his glory. [6:3]

The most appropriate passing away of the idols then is not a case where the doing away of the physical idols is always or even the most mature necessary prerequisite to their replacement by the Lord or Hosts in his holiness. The whole earth is always and already now full of his glory. But still whether or not the objects of idolatrous worship are standing

you may listen and listen, but not understand,
you may look and look again, but you will
not know [6:9]
[because]
this people's feelings are dulled,
their ears are deafened and their eyes are blinded. [6:10]

But this is a spiritual rather than a physical blindness, and the simple manifestation of physical objects does not open one's eyes to perceive the presence of the Lord of Hosts.

But
they may turn and be healed. [6:10]
Here the divine admonition is to:

inquire of the Lord while He is present,
call upon Him when He is close at hand. [55:6]

Isaiah
saw the Lord [6:1]
[when his]
sin was wiped away [6:7]

CHAPTER 8 – Prophetic Ontology

A postclassical (metalogical) prophetic vision of the nature of personal existence reveals a critical confusion pertaining to the creation and annihilation of man. In this confusion, that which is presumed to be the creation of man shows itself to be instead a spiritual annihilation of man. A vocation of postclassical metalogical prophecy is the tracing of the course of this confusion to facilitate the recovery of man from this spiritual annihilation.

Prior to a metalogical prophetic vision of the creation of man, he is presumed whether inadvertently or overtly to have come into being; i.e., to have been born and thus to have been created. This is the most natural way of viewing the ontological grounds of personal existence. This presumption takes several forms. Man is said to have been created by God (in His own image); or to have come forth from (to have been created by) and to be one among many parts of the cosmos; or it is said that Reality including (some how) a person's own Reality is only fulfilled or comes into being in relationship to a timeless realm of absolute essences by emanation or some sort of conformity with or perception of or derivation from this Ideal realm. Implicit in each of these views of the creation of man is an ontology in which the grounds of personal existence are essentially *contingent*; that is, man exists personally only as contingent to some Reality other than, and essentially outside of, himself and in and of himself is not really Real. But why are these ways of understanding the creation of man the most natural, and what is the nature of the metalogical prophetic vision of the confusion here which reveals the spiritual annihilation of man as a consequence of this confusion? And what is the nature of this spiritual annihilation?

Proximally, and for the most part, it seems to men that their everyday conceptions of the nature of their personal existence i.e., that which is most natural are most adequate and authentic, especially since they are quite obviously based upon that Reality which is closest to them viz., that which is present-at-hand. Eventually, however, some sense some limitations in conceiving Reality to be grounded essentially in the changing corruptibility of that which is present-at-hand (the realm of appearances) and presume to transcend these limitations by conceiving the essence of Reality metaphysically, without realizing, however, that while metaphysics transcends the changing corruptibility closest-to-them, it is still present-at-hand but now in the sense of a substantial timeless realm of Ideal forms and/or God, i.e., the essential what of Reality.

In a certain sense, everyday and metaphysical views of the creation of (birth) and the nature of (life) and the annihilation of (death) man are different world-views. Everydayness focuses its attention on the Reality of change and the objective world. Metaphysics is concerned with transcending the ever-changing everyday world to the constancy of a timeless nonobjective realm of essential Ideal Reality (without, however, sensing the *constancy* of an ever-changing world). Nevertheless, in a certain sense these world-views have something in common. Whether physically or metaphysically, both have a present-at-hand orientation; i.e., are oriented toward the what-it-is-ness of Reality. The ontological essence of personal existence the who-he-is-ness is lost in this present-at-hand orientation. In being-lost in the present-at-hand persons have fallen-away from who they essentially are especially into a present-at-hand contingency. In being-lost, persons do not authentically comport themselves toward who they essentially are, but do so rather to both sides of the contingency they presume themselves to be a part of i.e., are in a state of spiritual annihilation.

Yet everyday perceptions of Reality rightly sense that what is closest is (somehow) significant, and metaphysics rightly senses limitations in everyday perceptions of Reality (including the limitations of the existential premise that existence *precedes* essence), at least to the extent of seeing that transcendence is not thereby adequately accounted for. But since both conceive Reality to be present-at-hand, and since personal existence is not essentially present-at-hand, neither are able to account adequately for the meaning and significance of personal existence, and both thus move toward the spiritual annihilation of man. In a metalogical, prophetic envisioning of personal creation and annihilation, one sees both the ontological need and the possibility of seeing through each toward an authentic understanding of the personal existential nature of creation and life and annihilation.

What seems simpler than to characterize the creation and annihilation of man? The creation of man is said to consist of his being brought into being (birth) and the annihilation of man is said to consist of his being-no-longer (death). But what are the meanings and what is the significance of this being brought into being (birth) and this being no-longer (death)? It is usual to presume that everyone knows what birth (creation) and death (annihilation) are. This usual presumption, however, is grounded in everyday and

PART III – The Creation and Annihilation of Man

in the temple, presumably when many other persons were also present who, however, apparently did not see. This wiping away of sin through the transcendent seraphim transcended the ceremonial sacrifice for sin made by others in the temple (6:6).

Your countless sacrifices, what are they to me? says the Lord.
I am sated with whole-offerings of rams and the fat of buffaloes;
I have no desire for the blood of bulls, of sheep and of he-goats.
Whenever you come to enter my presence
who asked you for this?
No more shall you trample my courts.
The offer of your gifts is useless,
the reek of sacrifice is abhorrent to me.
New moons and sabbaths and assemblies,
sacred seasons and ceremonies, I cannot endure.
I cannot tolerate your new moons and your festivals;
they have become a burden to me,

Wash yourselves and be clean.
Put away the evil of your deeds,
away out of my sight.
Cease to do evil and learn to do right. [1:11-17]

Purged of his sin of pride, his vision is no longer obstructed by focusing his attention on the work of his own hands (2:8) and he is now able to:

come near him who puts nations into his power
and makes kings go down before him,
who scatters them with his sword like dust
and with his bow like chaff before the wind. [41:1-2]

He is the one who is

the Lord, the everlasting God [who] is creator of
the wide world,
and grows neither weary nor faint;
no man can fathom his understanding. [40:28]

But even though He is the one through whom
the world trembled from end to end [41:53}
and there is His
day of doom waiting [2:121
and though He is the one who will

judge by fire,
with fire he will test all living men [66:161]

yet He is not the one through whom this is the only (or even the last?) day
for thus says the Lord:

I [am the one who] will send peace flowing over her
[the new Jerusalem and the new heavens and
the new earth] like a river. [66:11, 12, 18-22]

He is the one who is a peacemaker.

How lovely on the mountains are the feet of the herald
who comes to proclaim prosperity and bring good
news, the news of deliverance. [52:7]

He is the one who delivers.

Come, all who are thirsty, come, fetch water. [55:1]

You shall indeed go out with joy
and be led forth in peace.
Before you mountains and hills shall break into cries of joy,
and all the trees of the wild shall clap their hands. (55:12-13)

He is the one who brings peace and joy.

Come to me. [55:3]

The Lord has bared his holy arm in the sight of all nations,
and the whole world from end to end
shall see the deliverance of our God. [52:10]

He is the one who delivers all nations.

Prophetic Anthropology

The anthropology of Isaiah is poetically dualistic. On the one hand:

All mankind is grass,
they last no longer than a flower of the field. [40:6]

birth (or conception) (creation) to be a present-at-hand bringing into being (an *ens creatum*) of a present-at-hand soul and a present-at-hand body concomitantly by God (as *ens infinitum*) from a present-at-hand nothing (*ex nihilo*). Inasmuch as personal existence is not essentially present-at-hand, this conception of birth is inauthentic in attempting to understand the essential meaning and significance of birth in personal existence. Having overlooked the distinctive nature of personal ontology, Hellenistic Christian ontology is in confusion at this point. Again, this is a confusion of present-at-hand possibilities and certainties with the possibilities and certainties of personal existence in care .

From the point of view of ecstatic temporality as the meaning of personal existence in care , we find that, while the ordinary everyday interpretation of personal temporality as a present-at-hand past and present and future, within its own limits, has its justification and is sufficient, we cannot adequately carry through an investigation ontologically of the way personal existence stretches along (is between) and is in and comports himself toward his own birth and death if we take this everyday interpretation as our clue (426).

Dasein does not exist in a framework which, as the connectedness of life , is drawn tense outside of *Dasein* and which begins at birth and which his existence fills up . *Dasein* himself is his own connectedness of life . *Dasein* does not fill up a track or a stretch of life one which is somehow present-at-hand with some present-at-hand phases of its momentary actualities. It is not the case that personal existence becomes actual in a point of time and that apart from this it is surrounded by the nonactuality of its birth and death. [Understood existentially, birth is not something past in the sense of something present-at-hand which is no longer present-at-hand (426).

A person is his own birth as *having-been* born , and is his own stretching along between birth and death in care . As such, he is the possibility of comporting himself toward his birth as his own personal possibilities in care . In essentially being his own connectedness in stretching along between his own birth and death, it is possible for a person to *pull himself together* (441) from the dispersion and disconnectedness of being lost in the fallenness of the they in such a way that he may comport himself toward his birth as being his own, i.e., he may bring himself to himself. In the fateful repetition of the possibilities of his *having been* born, a person brings himself back immediately that is to say, in a way that is temporally ecstatic to who he is as *having been*. When his heritage is thus handed down to himself, birth is caught up into his existence in coming to the possibilities of his birth (while he may at the same time be coming back from the possibilities of his death) so that, as personally existing, he may accept the thrownness of his being-there in such a way that he is free from trying to establish the meaning and significance of his personal existence on the basis of a birth which was present-at-hand (443).

meaningful conceptions (292). The existential problematic aims first at attempting to set forth something of the structure of personal-being-toward-the-end (death) (293).

Without these ontological clarifications, meanings in and the significance of personal existence are often vague and essentially overlooked, especially in confusing certainty and possibility. They, in their everydayness, say death is certain. But what does this mean? The gloomy mood and despair of the saying reveals the presumption that in saying that death is certain one has thereby completed the subject and in so doing has certainly affirmed a being-no-longer that is very bad news indeed because of our deep affection for still-being-alive. This everyday way of understanding that death is certain shows that it is not yet thinking about death (301) except vaguely as a no-longer of a present-at-hand body. But to think of the meaning and significance of personal existence either as being-present-at-hand or being-no-longer-present-at-hand is inauthentic inasmuch as personal existence itself is not essentially present-at-hand or not present-at-hand. Taken strictly, a certainty which is *only empirical* may be attributed to death. But in this determination of the certainty of death and of its impendence, what is manifested is a failure to recognize the essential nature of personal existence and personal being-toward-death. This epistemological failure is characteristic of everyday understanding. The fact that demise, as an event which occurs, is only empirically certain is not decisive as to the meaning and significance of personal existence (301). One *knows about* the certainty of death, and yet is not authentically certain in the sense of thus authentically understanding death or being-certain of the meaning and significance of death (302). In the face of definiteness and certainty such as this, a person flees and in so doing really flees from being-himself-authentically (302).

The everyday way of being-toward-death as a gloomy certainty of being-no-longer-present-at-hand is inauthentic. Personal existence is essentially and authentically possibility. From the point of view of everyday present-at-hand logic and epistemology whether sophisticated or not certainty is on a higher ontological level than possibility. On the other hand, possibility as a personal existential way of being oneself essentially is the most primordial and ultimate positive way which a person is-there. Being-toward-death as a personal possibility is ontologically more authentic and more basic in the significance of personal existence than is the certainty of death as a being-no-longer-present-at-hand in the inauthentic everyday way of understanding and thinking about death.

Everyday being-toward-death is the inauthentic, gloomy despairing fleeing from before the face of death as a certainty of being-no-longer-present-at-hand (being-nothing). Authentic being-toward-death is the anticipation of the fulfillment of a potentiality-for-being-oneself-authentically in one's own essential ways of being-himself (308). How is this possible? For instance, being-toward-death includes the possibility of being-one's-own-self. In other words, being-toward-death includes the possibility of a person's authentically distinguishing himself in his own essential ways of being himself from the inauthenticity of simply existing in the lostness of the fallenness of the they (307) (i.e., appropriately boundarying his personal existence personally) while at the same time authentically being-with and being-in others personally. But how is this possible? In authentically anticipating death, a person allows himself to understand that his own potentiality for being-himself-essentially *may be* taken over by himself. But again, how is this possible? In other words, since in some very real sense death is always one's own it is possible that it *may* become authentically *one's own* (308). This is possible when a person understands that death does not just belong to one's own existence in an undifferentiated way (308). A person understands this when he authentically anticipates taking over his own death as *his own*; which, in turn, in anticipation individualizes a person in some sense down to who he himself is essentially (308); which, in turn, discloses possibilities which lie-ahead-of these possibilities (309). That is to say, further, that since the possibility of being-toward-death in authentic anticipation of being-one's-own-self discloses possibilities which lie-ahead-of this possibility, it also includes the possibility of a person's existing as a *whole potentiality-for-being-himself-essentially* (309).

There is a sense in which these possibilities are *more certain* than the certainty of saying that death is certain in the sense of being-no-longer-present-at-hand. The *certain possibility* of the authentic anticipation of being-oneself-essentially in the authentic anticipation of the possibility of being-toward-death in such a way that one takes himself over as *his own* discloses the possibility of a person's being-himself-essentially in such a way that he makes this possibility possible (certain) for himself as (and from) his ownmost potentiality for being-himself essentially (309).

Birth

The implicit present-at-hand substantial ontology of classical Hellenistic Christianity conceives

God sits throned on the vaulted roof of earth,
whose inhabitants are like grasshoppers.
He reduces the great to nothing
and makes all earth's princes less than nothing [40:22]
[and]
All nations dwindle to nothing before him,
he reckons them mere nothings, less than nought. [40:17]

Even the Lord's own people are

a sinful nation, people loaded with iniquity,
race of evildoers, wanton destructive children. [1:4]

And yet

Though your sins are scarlet,
they may become white as snow;
though they are dyed crimson,
they may yet be like wool. [1:18]

The apparent basis of this convertible dualism is the particular potential of the reality of gathering Israel (43:5-6). Not only are they a sinful nation dwindling to nothing, but are also in some way at the same time:

the sons and daughters of the Lord [43:1, 6]
[whom he can]
bring from afar.
bring them from the ends of the earth. [43:6]

As such, the Lord is not only the possessor of Israel (19:5) who in his divine sovereignty empties the earth, splits it open, turns it upside down, and scatters its inhabitants (24:1), who punishes with his cruel, mighty, and powerful sword (27:1; 34:1-8), and who storms with rage on Mount Perazim (28:21), but is at the same time paradoxically he who is not only master but is also servant (helper):

The Lord God stands by to help me; [50:7]

The Lord has indeed comforted Zion,
Comforted all her ruined homes; [51:3]

not simply for the Lord's advantage but
thus says the Lord your ransom, the Holy One of Israel:

I am the Lord your God:
I teach you for your own advantage. [48:17]

When then it is proclaimed that

the Holy One of Israel has glorified you [55:51
[and]
the Lord shall be your everlasting light,
your God shall be your glory [60:19-20]

it is at the same time the case that

all the sons of Israel shall stand victorious
and find their glory in the Lord. [45:25]

Then shall your light break forth like the dawn [58:8]
[sparked by]
the light of my judgment over the nations. [51:4]

The man who walks in dark places with no
light but relies on his God [50:10]
[is enlightened]
But you who kindle a fire and
walk into your own fire
shall lie down in torment. [50:11]

The light and glory of the sons of Israel is not then simply a borrowed or reflected light but their own glory which is found and their own light, but which only breaks forth in the light and glory of the Lord. The Lord can consequently in form the house of Jacob that:

your own righteousness shall be your vanguard
And the glory of the Lord your rearguard [58:8]
[when they]
loose the fetters of injustice. [58:6]

In the accompanying pronouncements of God as creator and creating, Isaiah never speaks of the divine creative activity as simply bringing man into being. Creation is always the bringing into being of the gathering together of the sons and daughters of God and Israel from their darkness into his light, which then brings forth their light (40:26 41:10; 42:1-7; 45:18-25).

But now this is the word of the Lord,
the word of your creator, O Jacob

essentially dynamically changeless .

Being-In and Being-Toward Death and Birth

Death

An ontological vocation of metalogical postclassical prophecy is an introduction to and a guarding of a modesty through which something of the phenomenal personal-being-there (*Dasein*) in human existence is seen in a perspective in which a persons comporting himself toward his birth and his creation and his death is in an appropriate balance with the meanings and significance of his personal-being-there (*Dasein*) in divine light.

What seems simpler than to characterize the connectedness of life between birth and death? It is said to consist of a sequence of experiences in time . But what is the nature of this *connectedness* ? Is what is really actual in each case just that experience (and that body) which is present-at-hand in the current now , while those experiences which have passed away or are only coming along , either are no longer actual as present-at-hand or are not yet actual as present-at-hand? Does *Dasein* hop, as it were, through the sequence ofnows of a present-at-hand time (425) which has a beginning (birth) and an end (death)? Such is the import of the everyday conception of the temporal existence of a person between birth and death. In this way of characterizing the connectedness of life, one has posited something present-at-hand in time (426). And yet this everyday conception somehow remains vague (426).

For, in spite of the *constant* changing of these experiences between birth and death , personal existence somehow maintains itself throughout with some sort of selfsameness (425). If this state-of-being is a significant clue, and if the personal-existential-ecstatic-essential-temporality we have so far suggested is even approximately adequate, we find that a satisfactory ontology of either the way persons stretch along between birth and death or comport themselves toward birth and death cannot be grounded in a simple present-at-hand analysis (426) since personal-being-there is not simply present-at-hand. *Dasein* does not exist as the sum of the momentary actualities of experiences which come along and successively disappear (426).

The togetherness of personal existence in running its course until that course has been completed is not constituted by a continuing piecing-on or piecing-off of entities which, somehow and somewhere and somewhen, are simply present-at-hand. Whenever-whenever *Dasein* exists, he exists in such a manner that his not-yet and his now and his having been belong to him (287) and are such that he already exists in them personally in some way.

To say that in death personal existence has indeed fulfilled its course is not best understood simply in terms of supposing that this means a present-at-hand stopping or ending or being fulfilled or getting finished or disappearing. By none of these modes of conceiving death can it be suitably characterized as the end of personal existence, for then *Dasein* would thereby be simply treated as something present-at-hand. On the contrary, just as personal existence is *already* its having-been and its not-yet in some way, so it is *already* in some way its own end (death) too. This is best clarified by considering the being-toward-the-end of death (289).

Ending, as being-toward-the-end, needs to be clarified ontologically in terms of being-personal, and will become intelligible only if the character of ending has been determined in terms of the nature of personal existence (289-290). Death existentially is a phenomenon of life. But when the question is formulated only from the point of view of the sciences of biology, physiology, and anthropology, etc., the investigation takes place only in that domain of being which we know as the ontical world of animals and plants and mankind (290).

Underlying this biological-ontical exploration of death is a problematic that is ontological. We still need to ask how the ontological essence of death is properly understood in terms of that of life (290).

In an ontology of personal-being-toward-death, an ontical stand is neither a necessarily exclusive way of understanding death nor is it the most appropriate way of doing so. If death is defined existentially as the end of *Dasein* or the fulfillment of life , this is not meant to imply any ontical or ontological decision whether after death still the same being or another being either higher or lower is possible ; or whether *Dasein* lives on or even outlasts itself and is immortal . Nor is anything decided either ontically or ontologically at first about the other-worldly and its possibilities . Only when death is conceived in its full this-worldly ontological essence existentially can we have much methodological assurance in even asking *what may be after death*; only then can we do so with much hope for

exists, he is not essentially past or present or future as a factual present-at-hand existence, but is always already having-been in the sense of *I-am-personally-having-been-myself-essentially* ; and is always already being-there in the sense of *I-am-personally-being-myself-essentially* ; and is always already becoming in the sense of *I-am-personally-becoming-myself-essentially* (376). These items of care have not been pieced together cumulatively so that essential existential temporality has been put together in the course of time (376). Essential temporality in personal existence is one's primordial personal being outside of himself in and for himself essentially (ecstasy) (377). The time which is accessible to common sense is not primordial, but does arise from primordial ecstatic temporality (377).

When, then, one understands oneself projectively (futurally) in an existential possibility (futurity), futurity underlies this understanding and it does so as a person coming-toward-himself out of (ecstatically) that (current) (always) (already-in) (being-there) possibility in which one personally exists (385). This is the case, even though proximally and for the most part concerned being-in-the-world understands itself in the present-at-hand terms of that with which he is concerned (386). In other words, everyday concern understands itself in terms of that potentiality-for-being which confronts one present-at-handily as coming from its possible success or failure with regard to whatever its object of concern may be (387). This understanding, as such, has not yet reached its ontological basis, viz., one's *coming toward himself* (387) personally.

When one understands himself from his past he does not adequately do so ontologically by a simple discovery of who he is by a simple tracing of a series of present-at-hand events which have now culminated in a present-at-hand finding-himself. Nor does one find himself simply as a free-floating existence with no attachments to a past. But personal existence is being-thrown (*geworfenheit*). Existentially, being-thrown means always being-found (*befindlichkeit*) in some personal way or another of being-oneself and, as such, always finding oneself in some state-of-mind (mood) or other (389). But what is the ontologico-temporal constitution of being-in-a-mood, and how is it made visible? While moods are ontically well known to us, their meanings and significance are not properly recognized in their primordial existential function when regarded solely as fleeting experiences out of the past which color one's psychical condition. Anything which is observed as turning up and disappearing in a fleeting manner nevertheless does so out of the primordial mood-care constancy of personal existence without whose background they could not do so (390). The visibility of moods is manifest in both a present-at-hand understanding of a present-at-hand past and the ontologico-temporal having-been of a persons continually being-brought-back-to-himself in which this present-at-hand past-ness is grounded (390).

Understanding the meanings and significance of one's own personal existence is never simply free-floating but is always in some state-of-mind (mood). The personal-being there is disclosed in one's mood in every case or is closed off by it even though it is still-there. Being-in-a-mood which a person (*Dasein*) always is brings him face-to-face with his thrownness (*geworfenheit*) in such a manner that his being-thrown is not simply a finding himself to be a present-at-hand culmination of present-at-hand past events or a free-floating present-at-hand existence with no attachments to a past, but is disclosive of the more primordial who-and-how one is (389). One's mood discloses in the manner of turning toward or turning away from one's own personal ways of being there. Being-brought face-to-face with the that-he-is and the who-he-is of his own personal thrownness whether authentically revealing it or inauthentically covering it up becomes existentially possible only if personal existence, in the primordiality of its very existence, constantly is as *having been* (390).

In being-lost in the fallenness of the everyday world, persons understand the present as present-at-hand and so understand themselves and tend to make it so. In doing so, the ontological grounding of this present-at-hand present is overlooked and *Dasein* does not let himself come to himself essentially. When he does come to himself, he sees that he himself being-there-personally is both his own ground of being-personally-present and is also the ground out of which the present as present-at-hand arises.

When the temporality of personal existence thus shows itself ontologically to be ecstatic i.e., is in a constancy in which a person is constantly ahead-of-himself-and-behind-himself-already-being-in-himself-as being alongside entities-within-a-world and as such is always already there coming backward and forward to himself he at the same time shows himself ontologically to be an ecstatic unity in which his temporality always temporalizes itself as a whole whether it has the character of being past or present or future. This means that in the ecstatic unity of his personal existence in which his temporality is fully temporalized is grounded the totality of the temporality of his personal existence (401). Only out of the unity of this temporalizing whole is a succession of events as past, present, and future essentially meaningful and significant. In this unity, a temporality is possible in which it temporalizes itself as a future which makes present in the process of having been (401). Personal existence is

When you pass through deep waters, I am with you,
when you pass through rivers
they will not sweep you away; [43:1-23]

Have no fear; for I am with you.
I will bring your children from the east
and gather you all from the west,
I will say to the north, give them up,
and to the south, Do not hold them back.
Bring my sons and daughters from afar,
bring them from the ends of the earth. [43:5-6]

Eventually, however, and through all of this, men will get to a point where they no longer need a shepherd.

Then, like a gazelle before the hunter
or a flock with no man to round it up,
each man will go back to his own people,
everyone will flee to his own land. [13:14]

Anthropologically, the poetic-prophetic implication of Isaiah, then, is not only some sort of a nihilistic anthropology, but is also and at the same time an ontological implication of some sort of nonnihilistic anthropology as well. Whatever ontological potential this implies, however, the divine admonition to modesty in worship and supplication is pronounced presumably as an important step in a mature recovery from the cries of both a simply nihilism and idolatry.

Inquire of the Lord while he is present,
call upon him when he is close at hand.
Let the wicked abandon their ways
and evil men their thoughts:
let them return to the Lord, who will have pity on them,
return to our God, for he will freely forgive.
For my thoughts are not your thoughts,
and your ways are not my ways.
This is the very word of the Lord.
For as the heavens are higher than the earth,
so are my ways higher than your ways
and my thoughts than your thoughts. [55:6-91]

Prophetic Sociology

Isaiah's prophetic-poetic sociology exposes a spectrum showing the whole range of human existence. He glances briefly into the psycho-sociology of being alone.

Shame on you! you who add house to house
and join field to field,
until not an acre remains,
and you are left to dwell alone in the middle of
the land. [5:8]

His primary concerns are urban, national, international, and ecumenical. Several thematic threads bind together these sociological hymns he sings: war and peace; justice and injustice; and scattering and gathering.

For Isaiah there is the unfaithful and the faithful city (1:21, 26-27). In the unfaithful city:

your very rulers are rebels, confederate with thieves;
every man of them loves a bribe
and itches for a gift;
they do not give the orphan his rights,
and the widow's cause never comes before them. [1:23]

It is full of violence (28:2; 60:18), robbery (61:8), oppression (60:11, 1:17), and wrongdoing (61:8), and many are downtrodden and distressed (66:2).

You have ravaged the vineyard,
and the spoils of the poor are in your houses.
Is it nothing to you that you crush my people
and grind the faces of the poor? [3:14; 10:1-3]

Because the Lord is so close to his people (55:6; 56:1) their social unfaithfulness is also an apostasy from him.

This people approach me with their mouths
and honor me with their lips
while their hearts are far from me,
and their religion is but a precept of men,
learned by rote. [29:13]

Important signs and portents of this unfaithfulness are pride and finery:

grinding the faces of the poor [3:15]

holding themselves high
and walking with necks outstretched and enticing eyes [3:16]
[displaying]
anklets, discs, crescents, pendants, bangles, coronets,

his own past and present and future (390). This is not to suggest that such a thing as a simple historical past is meaningless, but rather that its possibility and meaning are essentially grounded in the existential-being-there in personal existence.

Existential being-there is inevitably personal since *Dasein* is an entity who in each case I myself am (78) and consequently, as such, every aspect of his existence is essentially personal.

Dasein is his own possibility, but inasmuch as his possibility is personal, the being-possible which he is existentially in every case is to be sharply distinguished both from empty logical possibility and from the contingency of something present-at-hand. As a modal category of presence-at-hand, possibility signifies what is *not yet* actual and what is *not at any time* necessary. It characterizes the *merely* possible. Ontologically, it is on a lower level than actuality and necessity. On the other hand, possibility as a personal existential is the most primordial and ultimate positive way in which a person is-there. Possibility as a personal existential does not signify a free-floating potentiality-for-being in the sense of the liberty of indifference. In every case, *Dasein*, as essentially finding-himself-there-as-to-who-he-is (*befindlichkeit*), is already-in definite possibilities personally. He is his own possibility of being-free for his own personal potentiality-for-being-himself-essentially. His own being-possible existentially is transparent to himself in different possible ways and degrees (183).

For example, being-possible-personally is a possibility of understanding. This understanding is not primarily an understanding of things, though understanding information is possible on this basis. This understanding is a disclosing which is a projecting of a person's possibilities in and upon himself in such a way that he is free for his own possibilities of being himself essentially (184, 185, 192). This understanding is illuminating. To say that a person is illuminated means that, as being-there personally in his own existence, he is cleared in himself, not only through some other entity, but in such a way that he is himself his own clearing (171). The light which constitutes this clearedness of *Dasein* is not something optically (objectively) present-at-hand as a power or source for a radiant brightness occurring in the entity on occasion. That by which a person is essentially cleared in other words that which makes him both open and bright for himself is care. In persons care is grounded the disclosedness of personal being-there. Only by this clearedness is any illuminating, understanding, and seeing possible (401-402). Understanding as an illuminating disclosure in the potentiality of persons being-free for their own possibilities of being themselves essentially is possible only because *Dasein is-there* personally.

This is not to suggest that the illuminating disclosure of persons' own possibilities of being themselves essentially is only an authentic illumination. Inasmuch as *Dasein* being there reveals himself to be not only his own *possibility* for being himself essentially but also proximally and for the most part being-lost in the fallenness of the indefiniteness of the they, his being-there makes inauthenticity as well as authenticity possible (78).

Temporality in the Constant-Self-Subsistence of Personal Existence

From the point of view of logic, Reality must be either dynamic (the changing existence of appearances) or static (unchanging essence). Personal existence, however, shows itself phenomenally to be metalogical. The essence of personal existence is *in* personal existence. In other words, the temporality of personal existence (the dynamics) is *in* the constant-self-subsistence (essence) of personal existence, i.e., in one's own essential ways (personal dynamics) of always being-himself. This is overlooked, however, until one traces ontologically the habitual conceiving of the nature of time only in terms of a simple present-at-hand past, present, and future. To what does this present-at-hand conception point ontologically?

Personal existential temporality is essentially ecstatic, from which is derived the everyday sensation of time as a continuous succession of present-at-hand nows in a connected series. In other words, personal existential temporality is involved in two aspects of temporality, viz., the ontological temporality of personal existence constantly coming back and forth to and from itself essentially in one's own ways of being-himself personally and everyday present-at-hand temporal series of nows. But in present-at-hand temporality, the ecstatic unity in which it is grounded remains proximally and for the most part concealed, but is nevertheless there.

Avoiding the confusing of the essential temporality of the ecstatic unity of personal existence with the simple present-at-hand temporality of past, present, and future is a critical venture in uncovering meanings in and the significance of personal existence. We call a present-at-hand entity past when it is no longer present-at-hand. But the ontological structure of that personal entity which, in each case, I myself am, centers in the self-subsistent being-there (*Dasein*) of my own personal existence in care (381). *Dasein*'s unity and totality in the personal existentiality of his care means that as existing he is constantly ahead-of-himself-and-behind-himself-already-being-in-himself-as-being-alongside-entities-within-a-world (375). As long as a person factually

entities who are in-the-face-of-which and are also always a manifestation of an already-there . Working with equipment ontically provides an ontological clue pointing to the ontological already-there of personal existence. Whenever we go to work and seize hold of something, we do not push out from some absolute nothing and come upon some item of equipment which has been presented to us in isolation ; in laying hold of an item of equipment, we come back to and forward to it from whatever work-world has already been and is being disclosed (403-404).

The metalogical theological implication of this nothingness of indefiniteness from which personal authentic existence is created is not existentially idolatrous. Here the divine and the divine creative activity is not simply an external divine (present-at-hand) source of contingency nor an external will imposed upon personal existence arbitrarily nor creating personal existence arbitrarily, but is rather divine manifestation in essential personal being.

The confusing of ontical everyday fearing and ontological anxiety points to a confusing of their significance and meaning. In the lostness of their personal existence, persons flee from fearful entities within the world which are present-at-hand and by analogy the present-at-hand absolute nothingness of non-being (from which personal existence is presumably created) and from the frailties of the world of appearances. Men have sought the security of Being something through a presumed possibility and necessity of a (present-at-hand) Being-contingent to absolute Divine Being or absolute Truth through a Divine creation and Divine sustenance and/or a (constant) beholding of absolute truth. This ontico-ontological confusing of the fearing of everyday existence with ontological anxiety is at the same time a confusing of the lostness of fallenness in the they with a fear of non-being . The fearing of this lostness is inauthentic with respect to the potentiality of being-found in the ontological possibilities of personal existence. The confusing of this fear with a presumed ontological fear of Being-absolutely-nothing except for a personal (present-at-hand) contingency to the Divine and/or to absolute Truth is, at the same time and in the same way, inauthentic with respect to the personal potentiality of being-found in one s personal existence through the anxiety of being-lost in the nothingness of the they.

What every aspect of this ontico-ontological confusion manifests in persons lostness in their absorption in the they is a fleeing of people in-the-face-of themselves themselves as authentic potentiality-for-being-themselves essentially. That is, men in the lostness of their fallenness are afraid of themselves of trusting their own potentiality for being themselves essentially and of being themselves a suitable phenomenal basis for investigating their own essential natures. To bring himself face to face with himself is precisely what persons do not do when they thus flee from themselves. They turn away from themselves in accordance with their own most inertia of falling. In investigating such phenomena adequately, care must be taken not to confuse ontico-existential characterization with phenomenal ontologico-existential Interpretation. From an everyday existential point of view, the authenticity of Being-one s self has been closed off and thrust aside in falling; but to be closed off is merely the privation of a disclosedness which manifests itself phenomenally (though conversely) in the fact that a person s fleeing is a fleeing in the face of himself. To be sure, that in the face of which he flees is *not grasped* in thus turning away in falling; nor is it experienced directly in simply attempting to turn back to it. Rather, in turning away from it, it is disclosed there as being-there (*Dasein*) when appropriately seen as a turning away from himself, which makes it phenomenally possible to grasp existential-ontologically the who in the face of which persons fallingly flee. So, in orienting an analysis by the phenomenon of falling, we are not, in principle, condemned to be without any prospect of learning something ontologically about the personal being-there (*Dasein*) disclosed in that phenomenon (229).

Personal Existential Being-There (Dasein)

A primary source of destructive conflicts in human existence is a lack in understanding the being-there (*Dasein*) in personal existence. This lack in understanding is characterized by a confusing of personal existential being-there with its objective (present-at-hand) and subjective (including Ideal) corollaries of being-there in such a way that these corollaries are taken to be the whole of or the central feature of personal existence (172).

Personal existential being-there (*Dasein*) is that being-there in which one s own existence is an issue for and in himself (182). As an issue for and in himself, a person is constantly coming backward and forward to himself, whether authentically or inauthentically. In this coming constantly to himself is a temporality, but one whose personal existentiality is not to be fully understood as a simple temporality of past, present, and future. A person being-brought face to face to and in the who-he-is of his own thrownness (*geworfenheit*) or his finding-himself-there-as-to-who-he-is (*befindlichkeit*) whether authentically revealing himself or inauthentically covering himself up is (existentially) only because he-is-as-having-been-and-becoming ; that is, he is essentially and ecstatically and existentially and at-the-same-time

headbands, armlets, necklaces, locketts, charms,
signets, nose-rings, fine dresses, mantles, cloaks,
flounced skirts, scarves of gauze, kerchiefs of linen,
turbans and flowing veils. [3:1 8-23]

Only with the dissipation of this unfaithfulness can the faithful city be established (6 1:4). It is so entrenched, however, that drastic measures are necessary. Paradoxically, divine-human peace can come only through divine-human war. The armor of pride is pierced only by the divine fury and rage (63:6). Before the faithful city can be constructed, the unfaithful city must be carefully dismantled and reconstituted.

Shall a woman bear a child without pains?
give birth to a son before the onset of labour?
who has heard of anything like this?
who has seen any such thing?
Shall a country be born after one day s labour?
shall a nation be brought to birth all in a moment? [66:7-8]

For the Lord of Hosts has a day of doom waiting [2:1 2]

In that day the Lord will take away all finery [3:18]

So instead of perfume you shall have the stench of decay
and a rope in place of a girdle,
baldness instead of hair elegantly coiled,
a loincloth of sackcloth instead of a mantle. [3:24]

What will I do to my vineyard:
I will take away its fences and let it be burnt,
I will break down its walls and let it be trampled underfoot. [5:5]

This people s hearts are hardened,
their ears are deafened and their eyes blinded. [6:10]

Then I asked, How long, O Lord? And he answered,
Until cities fall in ruins and are deserted,
houses are left without people,
and the land goes to ruin and lies waste,
until the Lord has sent all mankind far away,
and the whole country is one vast desolation. [6:11-12]
The Lord of Hosts planned it to prick every noble s pride. [23:91]

On that day the Lord will punish

with his hard sword, his mighty and powerful sword,
Leviathan that twisting sea-serpent,
that writhing serpent Leviathan,
and slay the monster of the deep. [27:1]

See, the Lord has one at hand, mighty and strong,
whom he sets to work as a mighty storm in the land,
like a sweeping storm of hail, like a destroying tempest. [28:2]

But how is all this to be accomplished? The destiny of the city is tied to the destiny of nations. Objective corollaries of the Lord's mighty deeds in Israel and Judah are the Assyrians, the Babylonians, and the Egyptians, in complex combinations and alliances of faithfulness and unfaithfulness.

I have given my warriors their orders
and summoned my fighting men to launch my anger;
they are eager for my triumph.
Hark, a tumult in the mountains, the sound of a vast multitude;
hark, the roar of kingdoms, of nations gathering!
The Lord of Hosts is mustering a host for war,
men from a far country, from beyond the horizon.
It is the Lord with the weapons of his wrath
coming to lay the whole land waste.
Howl, for the Day of the Lord is at hand;
it comes, a mighty blow from Almighty God. [13:1-6]

On that day the Lord will whistle for the fly
from the distant streams of Egypt
And for the bee
from Assyria.
On that day the Lord shall shave the head and body
with a razor hired
on the banks of the Euphrates. [7:18-20]

The Assyrian! He is the rod that I wield in my anger,
and the staff of my wrath is in his hand.
I send him against a polluted nation,
I bid him march against a people who rouse my wrath. [10:5-6]

The mighty deeds of the Lord are not only national and international in Israel, Judah, Assyria, Babylonia, and Egypt, but are also ecumenical.

The Lord has stretched out his hand over the sea

an absolute nothing which becomes something only as a contingent something whose reality somehow therefore rests solely on the being made something from nothing through divine creative activity. Man's fearing, then, is a fear of being nothing, i.e., a fear of non-being. Man's salvation, then, is in his contingency to the divine through which he is given Being.

Several problems still attend these ontological implications. In what sense is it meaningful to speak of an absolute nothingness? If evil is not Real, is it not Real because of its contingency? But then how is man as contingent otherwise Real? If it is Real as a contingency, how is it not divinely evil, or is it? What is the relationship of contingency and freedom? Is it meaningful simply to proclaim that man is somehow free even though contingent? What are the relationships between contingency and personal responsibility? Is it meaningful simply to proclaim that man is at the same time contingent and somehow responsible? Is fearing with its Hellenistic Christian implications to be understood as an ontical or an ontological phenomenon, or both? What bearing does this have on its implications? In these contexts, is the creation of man different from the production of goods? If so, how?

These questions also apply in their basic format to the Ideal Hellenism of absolutizing truth. Are the meanings and significance of personal existence contingent to some absolute truth? If so, is man, then, nothing in himself except as he somehow becomes connected to some absolute truth(s)? Is man's fearing, then, a fearing of being nothing unless and until he becomes-something by connecting himself with those Ideal truths existing in an absolute Ideal realm upon which his Reality is contingent? What is the exact nature of these connections?

When it is said that people have the experience of being afraid of something or not being afraid of something or of being afraid of nothing or of not being afraid of nothing, to what do these sayings refer? What is it that fearing discloses? To what does the fearing of everyday existence point ontologically, especially in terms of nothingness in personal existence? The only way that a meaningful nothingness pertaining personally to human and divine existence and relationships has so far appeared either ontically or ontologically is a nothingness in the face of

The implication of the absolute nothingness of personal existence except as contingent to the somethingness of divine creative activity and of beholding the Ideal truth shows itself to be a confusion of ontical everyday fearing and ontological anxiety. What is the difference phenomenally between that in the face of which anxiety is anxious and that in the face of which fear is afraid (230-231)? That in the face of which we fear is a detrimental entity within-the-world (230). That in the face of which one has anxiety is not an entity within-the-world: it is an *indefiniteness*; that is, *nothing* which is present-at-hand within the world functions as that in the face of which anxiety is anxious. Accordingly, when someone is threatened in his existence in anxiety, he does not see any definite here or there from which it comes. Anxiety is characterized by the fact that what threatens is nowhere. This nowhere, however, does not signify *nothing* in some sense of absolute non-being. It is already there as a threat and yet nothing present-at-hand. Its nothingness is both an indefiniteness (231) and a lostness in the fallenness of the they. When anxiety has subsided, then in our everyday way of talking we are accustomed to say that it was really nothing. And what it was, indeed, does get reached ontically by such a way of talking (231). Ontologically, however, this nothing is a being-in-the-world in the face of whose indefiniteness in the lostness of its fallenness in the they persons are ontologically anxious (232). This anxiety, then, does not point to some sort of absolute nothingness. It rather both points to the anxiety of the indefiniteness of being-in-the-world and at the same time opens up Men's (*Daseins*) possibilities of understanding their own authentic potentialities for being themselves essentially in the world which individualizes them for their ownmost possibilities which they themselves are (232). Ontologically, it is a nothingness in the face of something ontologically definite in the sense of a personal potential discovered.

And to what is one called when one is appealed to in the call of conscience which is disclosed in his anxiety in the face of this indefinite nothingness of his existence? To one's own self. Not so much to what he counts for, can do, or concerns himself with in being with one another publicly, nor to what he has taken hold of, set about, or let himself be carried along with (317) as to who he himself is essentially. He does not get called to that Self which can become for itself an object nor to that Self which dissects its inner life with fussy curiosity. The call tends toward passing over all this to eventually come finally to appeal to one's self who he is in his own essential ways of being himself in the world (318). Persons are ontologically called forward and backward into their own most potentiality-for-being-themselves essentially (318).

In other words, in his essential who, the caller is definable in a worldly way by nothing at all. Nevertheless, this is a nothing in the face of the something of his potentiality for being himself essentially (321). Being thrown into the nothing of the manifold world of his concern, in his anxiety a person tends, nevertheless, toward getting individualized down to himself essentially (322). That-in-the-face-of-which one has anxiety is indeed already there namely, a person (*Dasein*) himself (393). Persons are always manifest as

constantly present-at-hand, simultaneously passing away and coming along. What is implied by such an interpretation of the world-time with which we concern ourselves (474)? Plato directed his glance in this manner at time as a sequence of *nows* arising and passing away and called time the image of eternity which simultaneously shows its own *constant* presence (475). The source of time does not become a problem for Aristotle. His interpretation of time moves in the direction of the natural way of understanding Being. Time is that which is counted in the movement which we encounter within the horizon of the earlier and the later (473).

But what is ontologically decisive in personal existence lies rather in the specific kind of personal sources of *making present* which makes present-at-hand measurement possible (470). Personal existentially significant spannedness of time is not to be best understood in terms of the temporality which is made public in one's present-at-hand passing of time, but rather in terms of existential temporal concern. The fact that in every personal and existential *now* it is in each case *already now* is best conceived in terms of an existential *earlier* still from which every *now* stems. This *now* is not simply a continuity somehow of a series of present-at-hand *nows*, but does give the condition for the possibility of access to anything continuous which is present-at-hand (476).

The Hatter *said*, Why is a raven like a writing-desk?

Come, we shall have some fun now! thought Alice. I'm glad they've begun asking riddles. I believe I can guess that, she added aloud.

Have you guessed the riddle yet? the Hatter said, turning to Alice.

No, I give it up, Alice replied: what's the answer?

I haven't the slightest idea, said the Hatter.

Nor I, said the March Hare.

Alice sighed wearily. I think you might do something better with the time, she said, than wasting it in asking riddles that have no answers.

If you knew Time as well as I do, said the Hatter, you wouldn't talk about wasting it. It's *him*.

I don't know what you mean, said Alice.

Of course you don't! the Hatter said, tossing his head contemptuously. I dare say you never even spoke to Time!

Perhaps not, Alice cautiously replied: but I know I have to beat time when I learn music.

Ah! that accounts for it, said the Hatter. He won't stand beating. Now, if you only kept on good terms with him, he'd do almost anything you liked with the clock. For instance, suppose it were nine o'clock in the morning, just time to begin lessons: you'd only have to whisper a hint to Time, and round goes the clock in a twinkling! Half-past one, time for dinner!

(I only wish it was, the March Hare said to itself in a whisper.)

That would be grand, certainly, said Alice thoughtfully: but then I shouldn't be hungry for it, you know.

Not at first, perhaps, said the Hatter: but you could keep it to half-past one as long as you liked.

Ontologies of Nothingness

Hellenistic-Christian theology speaks of nothingness and nothing as non-being especially in connection with creation *ex nihilo* and the problem of evil as though it were somehow referring to or had adequately revealed ontological grounds for referring to a total nothing or an absolute nothing or an absolute non-being. This way of referring to nothingness and existence, however, has not been fruitful in revealing ontologically grounds for discovering meanings in and the significance of personal existence. Perhaps its accompanying view of the contingency of human life has limited merit with respect to the problems of human pride, but this limitation has also exhibited a strong tendency toward a nihilism through which the meanings and significance of human and divine existence (nature) and relationships are not adequately seen (are annihilated). A significant phenomenon of human existence through which nothing and existence may be explored in an attempt to reach the meanings and significance of the nothingness of personal existence is that of fearing. The ontological implication of Hellenistic Christianity simply presumes that this fearing is grounded in the absolute nothingness of human existence inevitably stemming from man's background as being absolutely nothing from which his creation is therefore *ex nihilo*. The Reality of personal existence, then, is

and shaken kingdoms. [23:11]

Beware, the Lord will empty the earth,
split it open and turn it upside down,
and scatter its inhabitants. [24:1]

The earth is completely emptied
and stripped bare. [24:3]

Desolation alone is left in the city
and the gate is broken into pieces.
So shall it be in all the world, in every nation. [24:12-13]

For see, the Lord is coming in fire,
With his chariots like a whirlwind,
to strike home with his furious anger
and with the flaming fire of his rebuke.
The Lord will judge by fire,
and with his sword; he will judge all living men. [66:15-16]

These are not, however, simply objective, historical events. There are corollaries of the Lord's mighty deeds which transcend these objective corollaries (and subjective corollaries as well).

The Lord washes away the filth
of the women of Zion
and cleanses Jerusalem
from the blood that is in it
by a spirit of judgment, a consuming spirit. [4:4]

Then a shoot shall grow from the stock of Jesse,
and a branch shall spring from his roots.
The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him,
a spirit of wisdom and understanding,
a spirit of counsel and power,
a spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord.
He shall not judge by what he sees
nor decide by what he hears;
he shall judge the poor with justice
and defend the humble in the land with equity;
his mouth shall be a rod to strike down the ruthless,
and with a word he shall slay the wicked.

Round his waist he shall wear the belt of justice,
and good faith shall be the girdle round his body. [II:1-5]

In the
city full of tumult, town in ferment
and filled with uproar [22:2]

some of the
slain were not slain with the sword [22:2]

for the Lord, the Lord of Hosts, has ordained
a day of tumult,
a day of trampling and turmoil
in the Valley of Vision. [22:5]

The Lord will judge with fire,
and with his sword he will judge all living men. [66:15-16]

The trans-subjective-objective corollaries of the events, then, are spirit, word, vision, and fire, especially the spirit of judgment, wisdom, counsel, knowledge, and justice.

The *telos* of all this is only properly seen by looking past the day of doom to still another day,

the Lord's holy day, a day to be honoured. [58:13]
This is a day of sorely needed rest, peace, joy and justice. In
its complete fulfillment it is an ecumenical day.

The whole world has rest and is at peace;
it breaks into cries of joy. [14:7]

This day does not all come at once, however. It proceeds from small beginnings to encompass ever-increasingly larger domains. Individual peace is only implied, and the explicit focal point of beginning is the holy city and the chosen suffering servant Israel, to whom other nations are attracted.

He said to me, You are my servant,
Israel through whom I shall be glorified. [49:3]

Arise, Jerusalem,
rise clothed in light; your light has come
and the glory of the Lord shines over you.
For, though darkness covers the earth
and dark night the nations,
the Lord shall shine upon you

significance in personal existence ontologically, we are faced with a perplexing dualistic paradox. We tend to lose our way both in the artificial abstractions of Hellenistic Idealism and in the commonsense lostness of being fallen in the practical everydayness of the *they*; and yet we need to somehow find our way through both.

A purpose of Hellenistic Idealism is to escape the limitations of commonsense everyday appearances to discover the nature (essence) of Reality. In its Idealism, however, it not only separates itself from these limitations but from the ontological meanings and significance of the everyday world as well. The more appropriate mode of uncovering the meanings and significance of personal existence ontologically is to see through both everyday common sense and Hellenistic Idealism. In our seeing through we are nevertheless still concerned with ontological essences, as is Hellenistic philosophy, but in a way that they show their connections with both the lostness of being fallen in the everydayness of the *they* of personal existence and the possibilities of being-found in one's authentic personal existence, and thus reveal more fully both its ontical and its ontological nature.

Here four philosophical keys open up ways of seeing through the paradoxes facing such an ontological quest. First, we discover that personal ontological essence is in personal existence. We also discover, surprisingly, that temporality characterizes the ontological essence of personal existence, even in the face of the Idealistic presumption that there must be a necessary distinction between essence and time (temporality change).

Spatiality also characterizes the ontological essence of personal existence, not only the present-at-hand spatiality of everydayness or the Idea of spatiality, but also existential spatiality. Finally, we see that personal existence is equiprimordially grounded ontologically in care in which we encounter everyday circumspective concern.

Present-At-Hand and Existential Space and Time

Cheshire Puss, Alice began, rather timidly, as she did not at all know whether it would like the name: however, it only grinned a little wider. Come, it's pleased so far, thought Alice, and she went on, Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to walk from here?

That depends a good deal on where you want to get to, said the Cat.

I don't much care where, said Alice.

Then it doesn't matter which way you walk, said the Cat.

so long as I get *somewhere*, Alice added as an explanation.

Oh, you're sure to do that, said the Cat, if you only walk long enough.

Everyday present-at-hand spatiality is characterized in saying that man's spatiality is a result of his bodily nature (corporeality). When a spiritual side of man's nature is brought into the picture, his being-in-a-world is characterized as the Being-present-at-hand-together of some such spiritual Thing along with a corporeal Thing (82). But man's facticity is such that his being-in-the-world is always dispersing itself in ways of being-in which show the ontological inadequacy of this present-at-hand dualism. For example, men are always having to do with something, producing something, attending to something, and looking after it. When we see through the Thinghood of existence, we see that all these ways of being-in show *concern* in their ways of being (83). We begin to see here, then, through present-at-hand spatiality a *spatiality of concern*. When space is discovered noncircumspectively by just looking at it, the environmental regions get neutralized to pure dimensions. Places get reduced to a multiplicity of positions for random Things. The personal involvement character of the spatiality of what is present-at-hand-within-the-world is thus *lost*; the environment becomes the world of nature. The spatiality of personal concern, and with it the ontology of personal concern, thus remains proximally still concealed (147). The existential nature of and connections between *res extensa* and *res cogitans* and personal existence at the same time remain concealed.

In factual existence, persons from time to time sense that there are some things for which they cannot allow any time. How can persons take time or lose it? Where do they take time from? How is this time related to person's temporality (456)? Time in the everyday world (and, by analogy, its essential form in the static realm of Ideal essences) is present-at-hand and is grounded in the movements of the sun which dates time. In terms of this dating, there arises the most natural measure of time the day (465). And because that temporality in which persons must find time in their everyday lives is thus datable, their whole lives are accordingly taken to be datable in the same way, i.e., finite (466). But the idea of a standard time also implies unchangingness; this means that for everyone, at any time, the standard, in its stability, must be present-at-hand (470). Thus, for the ordinary understanding of time, time shows itself as a sequence of *nows* which are

Whereas Judaic ontology proceeds from the practicality of a commonsense presence-at-hand, Hellenistic ontology is an Idealistic presence-at-hand. That which is present-at-hand in everyday commonsense ontology is properties which can be seen in the everyday world as the what of tables, houses, trees, human bodies, etc. (67). That which is Ideally present-at-hand in Hellenistic ontology is the substantial property of the essences of things (the Ideal forms) in a timeless realm of Ideal absolutes. For Descartes there is an implication that this Idealism includes (*res*) extension and (*res*) cogitation, though he does not specifically engage in ontological questioning of the nature of either of their relationships to each other or to a realm of Ideal forms or to the everyday world. However, there is a Cartesian implication that mathematical knowledge is the one manner of apprehending all entities which can always give assurance that their being has been securely grasped (128). Thus Descartes prescribes for the world an idea that its Real Being is a Being in which Being is equated with constant present-at-hand (129) substantiality and whether it be *extensio*, *cogito*, or *perfectio* is true of man and God as well as world (125-126). Present-at-hand substantiality is indicated in the ontological signification of the traditional term *existentia*, viz., the constant what properties of entities (67), whether Real or Ideal.

Like Descartes, Kant simply assumed the ancient ontology (45). In taking over Descartes' ontological position, Kant also made the essential omission of failing to provide an ontology of man (*Dasein*). What both left undetermined, as had the Hellenistic Christianity and the Hellenism before them, was the specific kind of Being which belongs to the *cogitans* of the *res cogitans*, or more precisely *the meaning of the Being of the sum* (the I am) in the *cogito ergo sum* (the I think therefore I am) (46).

Questions regarding the nature of existential temporality, of value-predicates and of existential concern point to the significance of these omissions. With their everyday conceptions of time, neither Descartes nor Kant could achieve an insight into the problematic of Temporality. There were two things that stood in their way: first, they neglected the problem of Being simply assuming the ancient ontology, and second, they failed to provide an ontology with man (*Dasein*) as its theme or (to put this in Kantian language) to give a preliminary ontological analytic of the subjectivity of the subject (45).

Idealistic Hellenistic ontology, including that of Descartes and Kant, are founded in such a way that even though Ideal they are so by analogy to the material cosmos (126) and as such preserve the

Thinghood of cosmological ontology, i.e., still have the character of present-at-handness. Quite apart from the ontological problem of the nature of the world itself, can the being of man whom we encounter proximally-within-the-world be reached ontologically by this procedure? When we speak of material Thinghood, have we not tacitly posited a kind of Being the constant presence-at-hand of Things which is so far from having been rounded out ontologically by subsequently endowing entities with value-predicates, that these value-characters themselves are rather just optical characteristics of those entities which have the kind of Being possessed by Things (132) and have not yet ontologically reached personal values? But even pre-phenomenological experience shows that, in an entity which is supposedly a Thing, there is something that will not become fully intelligible through Thinghood alone. What, then, does the Being of values or their validity really amount to ontologically? And what does it signify ontologically for Things to be invested with values (132)?

If we attribute spatiality to man (*Dasein*), then this Being in space should be conceived in terms of the kind of being he is. Man (*Dasein*) is essentially not a Being-present-at-hand; and his spatiality is not essentially an occurrence at a position in world-space. Man is in the world personally in the sense that he deals with himself and others and entities concernfully and with familiarity (138).

We see, then, several surprising paradoxes in Judeo Hellenistic-Christian ontological history. Hellenistic Idealism senses certain limitations in discovering the nature of things through commonsense appearances, viz., sees a need to discover the unchanging, secure, stable essence of things. It, nevertheless, continually does so by analogy to material Thinghood in such a way that it is unable to uncover the problematic of personal ontology. To do so requires a dismantling of the history of ontology by going back to practical, personal everydayness and a renewed consideration of ontology always keeping the nature of personal existence present as the primary ontological consideration. A sign of this ontological need is the implicit present-at-hand substantial ontology of classical Hellenistic Christianity. It has conceived birth (creation) to be a present-at-hand bringing into-being (an *ens creatum*) of a present-at-hand soul and a present-at-hand body concomitantly by God (as *ens infinitum*) from a present-at-hand nothing (*ex nihilo*). Death is the no-longer of a present-at-hand body. Immortality is the survival eternally of a present-at-hand soul and at some later present-at-hand time a concomitant union with a present-at-hand body, in a present-at-hand heaven.

Postclassical prophetic ontology begins here by giving consideration to the ontological meanings and significance of personal existence metalogically. It turns thematically to questions regarding personal-being and its dynamics and essence and temporality and spatiality metalogically, i.e., logic seen in a perspective of care and the spatiality of care and the temporality of care. In attempting to uncover meanings and

and over you shall his glory appear;
and the nations shall march towards your light
and their kings to your sunrise. [60:1-3]

In days to come
the mountain of the Lord's house
shall be set over all other mountains,
lifted high above the hills.
All the nations shall come streaming to it,
and many peoples shall come and say,

Come, let us climb up on to the mountain of the Lord,
to the house of the God of Jacob,
that he may teach us his ways
and we may walk in his paths. [2:2-3]

On that day this song shall be sung in Judah:
We have a strong city
whose walls and ramparts are our deliverance.
Open the gates to let a righteous nation in,
a nation that keeps faith. [26:1-2]

On that day
a blast shall be blown on a great trumpet,
and those who are lost in Assyria
and those dispersed in Egypt will come in
and worship the Lord on the holy mountain, in Jerusalem.[27:13]

And there shall be a causeway there
which shall be called the Way of Holiness,
and the unclean shall not pass along it
it shall become a pilgrims way,
no fool shall trespass on it.
No lion shall come there,
no savage beast climb on to it;
not one shall be found there.
By it those he has ransomed shall return
and the Lord's redeemed come home;
they shall enter Zion with shouts of triumph,
crowned with everlasting gladness.
Gladness and joy shall be their escort,
and suffering and weariness shall flee away. [35:8-10]

The Lord will make himself known to the Egyptians; on that day they shall acknowledge the Lord and do him service with sacrifice and grain offering, make vows to him and pay them. The Lord will strike down Egypt and heal them at the same time; then they will turn back to him and he will hear their prayers and heal them.

When that day comes there shall be a highway between Egypt and Assyria; Assyrians shall come to Egypt and Egyptians to Assyria; then Egyptians shall worship with Assyrians.

When that day comes Israel shall rank with Egypt and Assyria, those three, and shall be a blessing in the centre of the world. So the Lord of Hosts will bless them: A blessing be upon Egypt my people, upon Assyria the work of my hands, and upon Israel my possession. [19:21-25]

Finally

The whole world has rest and is at peace;
it breaks into cries of joy. [14:7]

They shall beat their swords into mattocks
and their spears into pruning-knives;
nation shall not lift sword against nation
nor ever again be trained for war [2 :4]

On this mountain the Lord of Hosts will prepare
a banquet of rich fare for all the peoples,
a banquet of wines well matured and richest fare,
well-matured wines strained clear.
On this mountain the Lord will swallow up
that veil that shrouds all the peoples,
the pall thrown over all the nations;
he will swallow up death for ever.
Then the Lord God will wipe away the tears
from every face
and remove the reproach of his people from the whole earth. [25:6-8]

Here is my servant, whom I uphold,
my chosen one in whom I delight,
I have bestowed my spirit upon him,
and he will make justice shine on the nations. [42:11]

He will make justice shine on every race,
never faltering, never breaking down,
he will plant justice on earth.
while coasts and islands wait for his teaching. [42:3-4]

CHAPTER 7 – Heideggerian and Post-Heideggerian Prophetic Ontology

Tracing the Historicity of Traditional Ontology

A prime vocation of postclassical prophecy is a search for the ontological grounds of personal existence. Judeo-Hellenistic-Christian culture is a primary source. Eros-inspired Judean culture has felt prelogical and protological inclinations. Hellenism and Hellenistic-Christianity have long been engaged in logical stages of this search. In the interplay of the metaeros and metalogos of postclassical prophecy is a renewal of this search. This renewal is impelled by indications of certain limitations in prelogical-protological inclinations and in logical searches, whose implications have a critical bearing on the physical and spiritual survival and existence of man. Tracing the historicity (429-458) of these ontological inclinations and searches helps locate sources of these limitations, especially when the history of the question of Being can be dismantled and made transparent in such a way that at least some of its hardened tradition may be loosened up so that its concealed inadequacies may be dissolved (44, 41-49).

A central feature of the Judaic influence in Western culture is its practicality, stemming largely from preclassical and to some extent classical prophetic (Old Testament) dimensions. Reality, especially for preclassical prophetic Judaism, is found in experiencing the everyday world with some unusual miraculous interjections, and consequently, at least by implication, is for the most part associated with change. As such, it has little if any direct orientation toward essence. Here the power of establishing justice for example is the proper divine-human coordination of everyday events in the reality of the everyday world through the proper practical means.

A central feature of the Hellenistic impact on Western culture is its logicity, stemming partially from early oriental-mystical influences through Platonic Idealism and Aristotelian quasi-Idealism-quasi-Realism. Platonism divides Reality into the essential un-Reality of the dynamic (changing) world of appearances and the essential Reality of the static (unchanging) world of Ideas. In Platonism, change is consistently associated with decay, corruption, ending, ceasing-to-be, and imperfection. Aristotelianism is basically Platonic with a quasi-Realism modification, viz., the material causality impregnated with the Ideal Forms is Real. Essence (essential Reality) in Hellenism is static and Idealistic. The gravitational pull of classical Hellenism moves forcefully toward attempting to go beyond (metaphysics) the unreal world of change to the Ideal realm of Being Real (philo-sophy) through logical dialectical speculation (47). Here the moving power behind the establishment of justice is somehow (Plotinian emanation) Ideal justice.

The traditional Christian dimension of Western culture is for the most part a Hellenistic Christianity. Augustinian Platonism and Thomistic Aristotelianism still regard the changing everyday world as essentially unreal and the unchanging (eternal, eternity, infinite) world of Ideas as essentially real, with some Aristotelian modifications. Medieval scholastic ontology inserted highly sophisticated Idealistic conceptions of God as *ens infinitum* into this cosmos. Then it added to the Hellenistic sense of creation as something having been produced the conception of an *ens creatum* of all things in the world *ex nihilo* (from nothing) by God as *ens infinitum* (infinite being) (46). Here justice is an Ideal Divine production.

Descartes and Kant worked within this conceptual framework. Descartes presumed that he had taken a radical departure therefrom with his *cogito ergo sum* (I think therefore I am) by supposing that he had developed an ontology based upon a radical separation of God, the I, and the world (128). Even though they again converge, it is still the result of an initial independence according to his analytic. In spite of the personal pronoun appearing in his proposal, however, he did not develop an ontology of the personal I in the *cogito* (I think) and the *sum* (I am). As in the case of both medieval and ancient Hellenistic ontology, his is still grounded in a present-at-hand ontology in which the being of God, man, and nature is substantial (even though divine being is infinitely substantial and human nature is finitely substantial). In the Cartesian view, substance is understood as an entity which is in such a way that it needs no other entity in order to be. Even created entities can be called substantial with some justification. Relative to God these entities need to be produced and subordinated; but within the realm of created entities the world in the sense of *ens creatum* there are things which are in no need of any other entity relative to the creaturely production and sustenance that we find, for instance, in man (125-126). The substantiality (the Reality of Being) of substance gets characterized as whatever remains constant in any corporeal thing (125). Matter may have such definite characteristics as hardness, weight, and color but these can all be taken away from it, and it still remains what it is. These do not go to make up its Real Being (124).

continuing need of further illumination of the nature of personal existence in terms of personal ontology.

Only relatively recently in human history has the significance of personal individuality been broadly recognized. Recognizing its significance, however, does not thereby automatically release its meanings. Locating adequate boundaries and relationships of individuals and communities is only now beginning to encounter significant widespread investigation. Metalogical prophecy is seeing investigations into the meanings of personal ontology to be necessary here.

The critical junction between preclassical, classical, and postclassical prophetic orientations is seen at this point. The prelogical, protological, and logical dimensions of prophecy are not yet as fully aware of metalogical personal ontology as is necessary adequately to augment the troubled course of peace, justice, and joy so far pursued by men.

This dimension of prophecy is seeking more and more to understand, live, and facilitate movements toward a metalogical personal ontology upon which peace, justice, and joy may yet be more firmly grounded. The basic point of departure here is the insight that men's essence is in their personal existence (IV:67).

The Lord has bared his holy arm
in the sight of all nations
and the whole world from end to end
shall see the deliverance of our God [52:10]

for my house shall be called
a house of prayer for all nations [56:7]

for behold, I create
new heavens and a new earth. [65:17]

(See all of Isaiah chapters 11, and 60-65).

In Elijah prophecy there is no joy. It is an expression of war, doom, conflict, and stress. The prophecy of Isaiah sees through these crises to a time of rest, peace, holiness, justice, redemption, light, and joy for cities, nations, and eventually all nations through the redeeming power of the Lord, the Holy One of Israel.

Prophetic Epistemology

The poetic-prophetic epistemology of Isaiah embodies and at the same time transcends that of Elijah prophecy. It shows a slight interest in foretelling the time of future events (16:13-14; 37:6-7) and intones against seeking guidance of ghosts and familiar spirits (8:19-22) and a certain category of divination (44:25-26).

Isaiah's major epistemological interest is in the nature of vision as a way of life. Of major concern are those who never see the things that the Lord has done (5:13; 6:10) even though the whole earth is full of his glory (6:3) and the Holy One of Israel is among you in majesty (12:6). Consequently:

my people are dwindling away
all unaware;
the nobles are starving to death,
and the common folk die of thirst. [5:13]

As a hedge against this calamity, the Lord has provided certain signs for the guidance of his people. Occasionally they are very specific omens in particular situations (37:30; 38:4-8). More often they are general signs. In either case, however, their nature and meaning are difficult to recognize and understand. Isaiah and his sons were given to be signs and luminous landmarks in Israel (8:18). Though his announcement of his own presence as a sign is an indication that it was not readily recognized as such, yet he still nowhere specifies the nature of this sign. He is a sign presumably to the extent that one understands the meaning of his life and ministry and light and enlightenment, and apparently such insight is prerequisite to a proper identification of Isaiah as a sign. Even the prescription of the Lord that I make my servants' prophecies come true (44:26) as a sign involves not only omens so specific as to be easily identifiable but again presumably involves the whole range of prophetic life so that much of the divine signature at times remains obscure. The same is apparently the case with the sign immanuel God is with us (7:14; 8:8-10).

One of the major themes of Isaiah related to the signs of the divine presence in the world is that of gathering. This involves both the gathering of Israel and of all nations (II:10-12; 43:5; 45:20). The proper identification of this sign and its meaning and significance comes however only with an understanding of reconciliation as its central element (II:13; cf. chapters 40-66).

Signs as hedges against the calamity of dwindling away and starving to death do not constitute an automatic and speedy resolution of the problem. They are only present as catalysts through which the life of vision may develop. The difficulty of seeing the prophetic vision of the meaning and significance of human and divine

existence is in its nature of transcending-objectivity-subjectivity.

This people's ears
are too heavy and drowsy to hear well
and their eyes
wander too much to see well [6:10]
[because]
their feelings are dulled
[their hearts are too fat, 6:10]
[because]
their eyes are proud
and they look too high to see things below. [2:11]

In the poetic-prophetic vision of Isaiah, the negative subjectivity of proud eyes but still the objectivity of suppressing certain feelings of realities underlying the establishment of personal justice are transcended to the extent that one truly envisions appropriate divine and human nature and relationships (10:1-4; 6:10).

What is needed to bring this vision is a change of direction so that they may turn and be healed. [6:10]

The Day of the Lord is coming indeed,
that cruel day of wrath and fury. [13:9]

I will check the pride of the haughty
and bring low the arrogance of ruthless men. [13:11]

Then, like a gazelle before the hunter
or a flock with no man to round it up,
each man will go back to his own people,
every one will flee to his own land. [13:14]
[Then]
the Lord has broken the rod of the wicked. [14:5]

The whole world has rest and is at peace;
it breaks into cries of joy. [14:7]

There are certain characteristics identifying the coming Day of the Lord and this turn to healing, rest, peace, and joy through which appropriate visions of divine and human nature and relationships occur.

The Dissipation of Idols

Those who trust in an image,
those who take idols for their gods
shall be turned around in shame.

human existence (IV:388-342). The voice and hearing are rather one's own essential ways of most appropriately being himself, essentially manifesting themselves in his personal existence in divine light. The divine light is the universal brightness and clearing through which the voice of conscience is manifest.

Neither is the seeing of the metalogical stage of postclassical prophecy to be closely equated with the everyday experience of seeing objectively. Nor is it essentially a seeing scenes in a trance. It is not essentially a viewing like our everyday objective experience of seeing, but in a trance state. It is not a seeing of events. Yet it is a vision. This vision, however, is a vision of the meanings and significance of the events and essence of personal existence in its essential rhythms and attunements and appropriations. This vision is en-visioning. Envisioning (in -visioning) is seeing more and more the meanings and significance of personal existence through and in existence. Envisioning the meanings and significance of this life is in living. These unveilings occur in proportion to the extent that persons become and are enabled to be sensitive to the essential dynamics of rhythms and tunes they are in (cf. IV:388).

The logic framework of Western culture has not seen clearly and consistently the meaning and significance of equations of truth and freedom and sin. In this oversight, metalogical meanings and the significance of personal existence are for the most part just dawning. A powerful drive toward absolute truth has paradoxically thwarted its coming forth, and yet provided important clues. The same may be said of its grave concern to classify man in the cosmos through the presumed adequacy of finding and expressing all knowledge in the generalizations as expressed typically in systematic scientific and philosophical treatises. Perhaps a deterrent to the coming to this equation is the general association of Western logical culture with preclassical prophecy and its limitations and difficulties in orienting its conceptions of sin beyond the simple formulation of sin as the breaking of divine commands.

Isaiah speaks of the necessity of turning from sin and being healed in order to see and hear properly (6:9-10). He sees beyond the limitations of the preclassical formula in his criticism of the unjust offering of gifts and sacrifices, sacred seasons, and ceremonies (1:11-17).

For metalogical postclassical prophecy sin is a person's imposing on (by hindering) another and oneself from being and becoming themselves essentially. In this hindering is an opacity toward who persons are essentially. In this opacity is a losing and distorting of appropriate essential attunements and rhythms in personal existence. This is a losing and distorting of seeing and hearing. Virtue is a person's being and becoming enabled to help another and himself toward being and becoming himself essentially. In this helping is the increasing possibility of more and more clarity in being-in the essential rhythms and attunements of existence. This is a clarity of seeing and hearing. In this clarity of seeing and hearing come more and more the essential meanings and significance of personal existence. This clarity comes as sin is dissipated.

Prophetic Ontology

Hellenistic and Hellenistic-Christian ontology has been and is preoccupied with cosmological ontology so much so that, in them, for the most part, the ontology of personal existence is overlooked. This oversight is not deliberate and for the most part is yet either unrecognized or misunderstood or denied. In pre-Hellenistic human existence, man is simply reckoned a more or less significant or insignificant part of the cosmos. Hellenism was overwhelmed from time to time with its particular discovery of human rationality and its meanings and significance. This led to a partial differentiation of man as rational from the rest of the cosmos, but this rationality was still looked upon as basically a cosmological rationality. The ontological nature of man as such is looked away from and is still determined on the basis of cosmological classifications through cosmological generalizations. His being as such is to be determined on the basis of simply determining generally what being is and classifying man ontologically on this basis.

Postclassical prophecy is aware of certain limitations of attempting to clarify personal human ontology cosmologically. Cosmology overlooks the distinctive way that a person exists in having a personal relationship with himself. Consequently, the meanings and significance of his wars with himself and his self-unity are not yet well understood. This, in turn, contributes to misunderstandings regarding war and unity in broader human dimensions. If persons losing and finding themselves is considered cosmologically, the essence of personal existence itself is not well illuminated. The whole question of the nature and existence of personal essence then becomes problematical.

When the ontological question of the meaning of possibility (potentiality) is raised, the same problem prevails. To speak of personal human potential is not exactly the same as to speak just in any sense of cosmological potential. The significant question of the existence and nature and meaning of human freedom is at issue here. That human history in general and Hellenistic cultures in particular continually stumble over these questions suggests a problem of inadequate ontological orientation. The important clue that postclassical prophecy points to is the

personal existence is not an absolute nihilism but is a nullity which includes the nullity of this gradual presencing (not always recognized or fully present) of the unconcealment of the essential character of personal existence. As one perceives these manifestations, the nature of the essential character of the existence of persons becomes more and more obvious in their own rhythms and attunements. When a person finds himself to be-in-tune in some aspect of his existence, he then knows it to be appropriate in its attunement. The hearing and seeing of the appropriate attunements and rhythms of personal existence are felt. Persons are better able to hear and see their own most appropriate attunements and rhythms as their feelings become more sensitive. These are not only the feelings of everyday existence (which are for the most part lost and scattered), but are especially the primordial feelings in the essential realms of one's own personal existence.

The dilemmas of relating the (nonpersonal) search for truth as an absolute idea in a realm apart to human freedom (which is at least suspected of being in some sense personal) in the logical stage of postclassical prophecy moves toward resolution in the meta-logical stage of postclassical prophecy. The overt character of behavior in the sense that it makes rightness (truth) a possibility is grounded in freedom. The essence of truth is freedom (I:303). But to turn truth into freedom is that not to abandon truth to the caprice of man (I:304)? The essential nature of truth as such which holds sway over man, metaphysics (logic) regards as something imperishable and eternal and as such something that can never be founded on the transitoriness and fragility of humankind. How, then, can the essence of truth possibly have a stable basis in human freedom (I:304)? The indication, however, of the essential connection between truth (as rightness) and freedom (I:305) is not grounded in what common sense is content to let pass under the name of freedom, i.e., the random ability to do as we please (I:307). Freedom is a participation in the revelation of what-is-as-such (I:307) especially in the depths of personal existence. Truth is the unconcealment and revealment of what-is. Truth in the metalogical dimensions of existence is not the mark of some correct proposition made by a human subject in respect to an object and which then in some way or other, precisely how we do not know counts as true; truth is rather the revelation of what-is, a revelation through which something overt comes into force. All human behavior and being is an exposition into that overtness (I:309). This revelation is appropriate. But, as in the hope of logic, we can never place this appropriation in front of us as an object in the sense of then being able to point it out to some sort of objective observation and demonstration since it is not something opposite us (II:23) but is our own bringing ourselves in and through divine light into our own most appropriate ways of being ourselves in our own appropriate time and place and way. The assimilation of appropriation here is an admittance into this bringing (II:23).

The essence of truth is revealed as freedom. This is the existent, revelatory letting-be of what is (I:310-311). The phrase letting-be of what is does not, however, refer to indifference and neglect, but to the very opposite of them. To let something be, in this way, is in fact to have something to do with it. This is not to be taken merely in the sense of pursuing, conserving, cultivating, and planning some actuality, causally or casually met with or sought out. To let what-is be what it is means participating in something overt in its overtness, in which everything that is takes up its position and which entails such overtness (I:306). Every overt mode of behavior vibrates with this letting-be and relates itself to this or that actuality. In the sense that freedom means participation in the revealment of what-is, it is attuned to all behavior. But this attunement can not be fully understood simply as everyday feeling and experience (I:311), which are for the most part scattered and lost. An attunement of this kind, i.e., the existent exposition into what is, can only be experienced and felt because the experient (I:311) is primordially attuned and as such is participating in an attunement revelatory of what-is (I:311).

In the attunements and rhythms and appropriations of persons being gathered home to the most appropriate combinations of being themselves most appropriately is found an essential hearing and an essential seeing. The hearing is the hearing of the call of conscience. The seeing is the seeing of the meaning of the signs of the scattering and gathering of men and nations in the visions of their essential natures.

The call of conscience points persons forward to their potentialities-for-being-themselves-essentially, and does so as a call which comes from the anxiety of homelessness (IV:325). When their calling moves persons toward their potentiality for being themselves essentially with some accompanying understanding of this potentiality, it is not simply either ideal and universal or particular and individual. The most appropriate gathering from the scattering of the lostness of homelessness is disclosed in the call of conscience as that which is most authentically and currently individualized and grouped together and universalized in those combinations of personal existence which are most appropriate.

The call of conscience comes through the voice of conscience. But what is this voice and how is it to be heard? What is the language of conscience? Here conscience refers primordially to the existential foundations of personal existence more than to some phenomena of everyday existence, and is ontologically prior thereto. This conscience is not such that it can be placed before us objectively in such a way that its nature may thus be shown and heard and investigated. Such demands have not yet reached beyond the confusing subjective-objective pursuits of logic. The voice of conscience is disclosed in care in personal existence. In this disclosure of care, the vocal utterance and hearing are not that of the everydayness in the objective correlates of

Hear now, you that are deaf;

you blind men, look and see. [42:17-18] [Cf. also 40:18-44:28]

Nearness and Divine Presence

Let the peoples come to meet me.

Let them come near, then let them speak;

We will meet at the place of judgment, I and they. [41:1]

Fear nothing, for I am with you;

be not afraid, for I am your God. [41:10; 43:5]

Nearness and the Spirit of Inquiry

Inquire of the Lord while he is present,

Call upon him when he is close at hand.

Let the wicked abandon their ways

and evil men their thoughts;

Let them turn to the Lord. [55:6-7]

Stillness, Attention, Listening, and Sensitivity

Long have I lain still.

I kept silence and restrained myself. [42:14]

Hear this, all of you who will,

listen henceforward and give me a hearing. [42:23]

Approach, you nations, to listen,

and pay attention you peoples;

let the earth listen and everything in it. [34:1]

Listen to me and you will have good food to eat,

and you will enjoy the abundance of the land.

Come to me and listen to my words,

hear me, and you shall have

that rich life which comes with abundant sensitivity

to the many subtle delicacies of a truly spiritual life. [55:2]

Harmony, Rhythm, Voice, Song, and Sensitivity

For you there shall be songs.

as on a night of sacred pilgrimage,

your hearts glad, as the hearts of men who walk to the sound

of the pipe on their way to the Lord's hill, to the rock
of Israel.

Then the Lord shall make his glorious voice to be heard. [30:29-30]

Comfort, comfort my people;
it is the voice of your God;
speak to Jerusalem
tenderly inside her heart and mind. [40:1-2]

There is a voice that cries:
Prepare a road for the Lord through the wilderness. [40:3]

Sing a new song to the Lord,
sing his praise throughout the earth. [42:10]

When one turns to the Lord

The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him,
a spirit of wisdom and understanding,
a spirit of counsel and power,
a spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord. [11:1-2]

This spirit of wisdom and understanding and knowledge is not simply objective, for:

he shall not judge by what he sees
nor decide by what he hears; [11:3]

Nor is it simply subjective, for:

he shall judge the poor with justice
and defend the humble in the land
with fairness to each one; [11:4]

Nor is it simply a focus on abstract principles, but is always connected with life in the real world.
The revelation of the Lord in the poetic-prophetic vision of Isaiah is characterized overall as one in which:

the Lord of Hosts has revealed *himself*. [22:14]

The revelation of human nature and relationship in the vision of Isaiah is always connected with the
revelation of the meaning of social justice.

The epistemological climax of the vision of Isaiah is optimistic.

of its existence, where, by its nature and proportionate to its own being, it belongs (I:247). Home is the place
and the way wherein alone men can be at home and so fulfill their destinies (I:248). Home is where the nature
and destiny of men and things are safely preserved (I:249), viz., where salvation takes place.

Prophetic Epistemology

Elijah prophecy tells of epistemologically ineffectual signs. The understanding necessary to overcome the
Baal-oriented idolatry did not occur during or soon develop from the climactic preclassical confrontation of Elijah
and the prophets of Jezebel.

Isaiah points to himself and immanuel as signs. This epistemological direction is unusual. An
explanatory elaboration of its meaning is not given. It nevertheless provides a significant clue for the epistemology
of postclassical prophecy. This clue supersedes the logical stage of postclassical prophecy, which has the character
of absolutizing truth into a realm by itself in terms of language and, especially, ideas to which men must
somehow conform if they are to progress in the epistemological endeavor of coming to the truth (I:297). This logic
has the advantage of leading men to a scientific culture and to whatever benefits it might afford mankind. It
has the disadvantage, however, of still overlooking much of the meaning and significance of personal existence.
What this absolutizing of truth overlooks are the personal rhythms of scattering and gathering and the attunements
and appropriations in personal existence which are manifestations of a coming-together on a more primordial
ground of personal existence than that attempted by the logical pursuit of truth, namely, care. The truth of the
metalogical stage of postclassical prophecy is personal in care. In this pursuit of truth, men are not attempting
to conform to an absolute truth (idea) in a realm by itself. Since the meaning and significance and value of
personal existence has for the most part not yet dawned in human history, so neither has the meaning and
significance and value of personal truth in care.

We ourselves are signs. As personally existing, we both point to and embody the meaning and significance
of personal existence. Persons are in truth in one another and entities. Being-in truth is a personal way of being
which is primordially true. The essential character of being-in truth personally is existential; that is, it is
persons own ways of being themselves essentially in one another in their existence. In this being-in
truth, persons own ways of being themselves in each other are not essentially comparable with one another and
entities in a truth-relatedness and in a value hierarchy in which one's own ways of being himself essentially are
more (or less) valuable or more (or less) true than another's.

The absolute realm of true ideas sought by the logical pursuit of truth is conceived to be
essentially static in nature. Personal truth is conceived in the metalogical stage of postclassical prophecy to be
essentially dynamic. These dynamics involve personal rhythms and attunements and appropriations in care.

Human existence is essentially rhythmic and attuned and is (and has) its own essential appropriateness in its
own appropriation. These essential rhythms and attunements and appropriations constantly show themselves in
many ways of being in human existence. The rhythmic interchange of war and of peace and of gathering and
scattering in the objective corollaries of human existence are manifestations (revelations) of some of the unsettled,
homeless, fallen aspects of these essential rhythms and attunements and appropriations.

The essential appropriation of appropriating and appropriateness is somewhat concealed in our destinies, but
is at the same time continually being revealed in the gift of the continual opening out of our destinies (II:19).
Sometimes appropriation is represented only as the appropriateness of something present (particularly as manifest
only or primarily in the objective corollaries of existence), whereas personal existence is also continually moving
toward understanding the essence of the presence of what the appropriation is of what is appropriate. The
appropriation and appropriating the appropriateness of what is appropriately present is the presencing and allowing-
to-be-present of the essential character in our personal destiny which is there (Dasein) (II:19, 21).

Appropriation withdraws what is most fully its own from boundless unconcealment (II:22). This means it
expropriates itself of itself (II:22-23). By this expropriation, appropriation does not abandon itself rather, it
preserves what is its own (II:23). Hence, appropriation lies (stands) in the realm of giving, though not in the sense
of losing itself in giving itself away (II:23). Being and time are there (Dasein) in the expropriation of appropriating
appropriation in the sense of being the peculiar disposition of persons bringing themselves into their own most
appropriate ways of being themselves in their own most appropriate time (II:23) in divine light which clears and
makes bright the way.

Far from pointing to an existence devoid of appropriately essential personal rhythms and attunements, the
rhythms of war and peace and scattering and gathering in the objective correlates of existence are manifestations
(revelations) of these essential characteristics of personal existence, which are, however, in the temporal
concealment of a gradual emerging in the overall most appropriate time of the destiny of our essential character in
our personal existence. As one perceives these manifestations, it becomes obvious that the primordial character of

(IV:210). Idle talk is characteristic of the scattering of this being lost. In the discourse-dialogue in the everydayness of the existence of being lost and scattered in the they, the nature of and relationship-of-being toward the entity talked to and about is not imparted by everyday talk. Because this discoursing is lost with respect to its primary relationship-of-being toward the entity talked to and about, it does not communicate (is not in communion) in such a way as to let this entity be appropriated in a primordial manner (IV:212). This idle talk serves not so much to keep open for us access to the essential nature and needs and rhythms and attunements in the destinies of persons as rather to close it off and cover them up. It discourages new inquiry (IV:213). When persons maintain themselves in idle talk, they are cut off from their primary and primordially genuine relationships with themselves and others. When in this way of being, they keep floating unattached (IV:214).

Everyday curiosity is also a sign of being scattered in the lostness of fallenness. In this floating, persons concern themselves with seeing, not in order to understand especially the essential nature of what is seen but just in order to see. The fallen and scattered seeing of curiosity is characterized by a specific way of not tarrying alongside and in what is closest and being primordially observant, but rather seeks restlessness and the excitement of continual novelty and changing encounters (IV:216). The essential characteristic of this not tarrying and this distraction is called not dwelling anywhere (IV:217).

In the idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity of everyday man is revealed a basic characteristic of human existence the falling of man, which has mostly the character of the scatteredness of being lost to themselves essentially and to others in the publicness of the they (IV:220). Here persons have fallen away from themselves and each other as authentic potentialities for being themselves together and have been scattered into the lostness of the everyday world of the they (IV:220). They are in confusion regarding their most appropriate ways of comporting themselves toward the most appropriate boundaries of their existence.

Because persons are scattered, the way they get interpreted is for the most part inauthentically oriented and does not yet reach the essence of who they really are (IV:326); that is, for the most part man is not at home yet in his existence he is unsettled. This homelessness is manifest in the rhythmic interchange of war and peace and scattering and gathering in the objective corollaries of human existence. This is a corollary of their search for their most appropriate boundaries.

In their homelessness, persons are in a state both of anxiety (despair) and hope. Isaiah envisions both an anxiety of scattering and a hope of gathering. For a time, while persons drift along towards an ever-increasing groundlessness, the essential homelessness of this floating remains hidden from them by the apparent obviousness (IV:214) and self-assurance of the average everyday ways in which things have been interpreted (IV:214). This everyday familiarity gives the impression to persons that they are now authentically at home in the world (IV:233). In this lostness, persons are inspired by an inauthentic hope. Yet from time to time, anxiety is manifest (IV:233) and brings persons back from the scattering of their absorption in the world and the being-at home of average everydayness to sense, however vaguely, that this floating is really a not-at-home (IV:233).

The most appropriate gathering from this scattering is that which is most authentically and currently individualized (IV:326) and grouped together and universalized in those combinations of personal existence which are most appropriate; it is the appropriation of the most appropriate boundaries in personal existence; it is the maturing of the process of persons most appropriately identifying and being-in their most appropriate combinations of personal existence.

The scattering and fallenness of being lost and homeless in the they and the human urge toward gathering home are signs. They point both to the need of and potentiality for a gathering home of persons to their own essential ways of being themselves in the destiny of their existence.

The manifestation of these phenomena reveals something of the essence of human existence. We see that essential being-at-home is not most appropriately simply determined by the geographical location of persons. The essence of scattering is revealed as a being lost in the fallenness of the they. The essence of gathering is manifest as being brought home to persons own ways of being themselves essentially. Here, the essence of war shows two manifestations. War emerging from the agency of idolatrous existence is manifestations of the violence of the misdirections of personal concern especially in their attempted gatherings in being lost in the homelessness of fallenness. Divine war is the suffering necessitated by the pain of gathering persons home in their anxiety from drifting along toward an ever-increasing groundlessness in the in-authentic hope of gathering home in the lostness of the deceptive familiarity of the they. The essence of peace is being-home. The essence of justice is the gathering persons home and being-home in and to their own most appropriate ways of being themselves in the essential rhythms and attunements of their own most appropriate combinations of personal existence. The essence of joy is the real-ization of being home. The essence of rejoicing is the singing forth (poesy) of the essence of joy.

The essence of home is where one receives what is found as one's own, to be able to dwell in it as in a possession (I:244). Everything of home is openly friendly, light, gleaming, shining, and bright (I:245). Home is a calm mien and its disposition is inviting (I:246). Home is where everything is housed in its proper place

The Lord has bared his holy arm
in the sight of all nations,
and the whole world from end to end
shall see the deliverance of our God. [52:10]

Prophetic Ontology

The poetic-prophecy of Isaiah doesn't speak directly of ontology. There are, however, ontological implications in this prophecy. In some sense:

those who forsake the Lord shall cease to be. [1:28]

A letting-be is implied in the comportment of the Lord to ward his vineyard.

I will take *away* its fences
and let it be burnt,
I will break down its walls
and let it be trampled underfoot. [5:5]

His concern includes what-is-to-be.

From ancient times I reveal what is to be. [46:10]

An ontological climax is pronounced in Isaiah regarding the fullness of time. Then:

your people shall all be righteous. [60:21]

Brief reference is made to the ontology of presence, particularly divine presence.

In the Lord alone, men shall say,
are victory and might;
and all who defy him
shall stand ashamed in his presence,
but all the sons of Israel shall stand victorious
and find their glory in the Lord. [45:24-25; 26:17]

The perplexing ontologically oriented pronouncement of a core ingredient of the divine name in Exodus 3:12-15 the I AM is repeated and affirmed and elaborated upon in Isaiah.

Whose work is this, I ask,

who has brought it to pass?
Who has summoned the generations
from the beginning?
It is I, the Lord, I am the first,
and to the last of them I am He. [41:4]

Fear nothing, for I am with you;
be not afraid, for I am your God.
I strengthen you, I help you,
I support you with my victorious right hand. [41:10, 14]

When you pass through deep waters,
I am with you. [43:2]

Have no fear; for I am with you. [43:5]

I am the Lord, I myself,
and none but I can deliver
you from your enemies. [43:11]

If you call, the Lord will answer;
if you cry to him, he will say, Here I Am. [58:9; 48:12; 16; 52:6; 65:1]

Isaiah also glances at the trying consequences of improper personal ontological identification.

Secure in your wicked ways you thought,
No one is looking.
Your wisdom betrayed you,
omniscient as you thought you were,
and you said to yourself,
I am, and who but I?
Therefore evil shall come upon you. [47:10-11]

The vision of Isaiah includes the ontological category of creation.

But now this is the word of the Lord,
the word of your creator, O Jacob,
of him who fashioned you, Israel:
Have no fear; for I have paid your ransom;
I have called you by name and you are my own.
When you pass through deep waters, I am with you. [43:1-2; 43:21; 44:1; 45:7-13; 48:7; 54:16-17]

phenomena of care in the self-subsistence of personal existence have not been and perhaps should not and cannot be at least in the capabilities of human personal existence systematized in the sense of the goals of the logic of logistics. Nevertheless, their phenomena show themselves in ways exceptionally significant and meaningful in the care of personal existence.

This self-subsistence and the nature of this self-subsistence is disclosed in the self-perception of personal existence which is disclosed in care in the voice of conscience. Here conscience refers primordially to the existential foundations of personal existence more than to some phenomena of social conditioning, and is ontologically prior to any description and classification of these experiences. In this self-subsistent disclosure of care, the voice is one's own essential ways of being himself emerging in his personal existence. This voice is more one's being-tuned-to-and-in and being-in-rhythm-with-and-in his own essential ways of being himself in his personal community than vocal utterance or hearing a voice as we ordinarily think of voice, although it always in some sense eventually emerges into words (IV:335-343).

There is a certain constancy which appears in personal self-subsistence. Its background is the constancy of one's own essential ways of being himself in his personal community in his care. It is in this constancy that one is and has his own stewardships and responsibilities and callings and joys and salvations in his life.

This revelation of the self-subsistence and constancy of one's own ways of being himself in his personal existence in his conscience in his care is not, however, at heart atheistic and idolatrous since its fulfillment is only possible in and through divine light. As Isaiah says, All the sons of Israel shall *stand* victorious and find *their glory* in the Lord (45:25). Then shall *your light* break forth like the dawn (58.8).

An attempt at the annihilation of this personal self-subsistence, especially in asserting the creatureliness and contingency of personal existence of the logic of logistics, is an attempted though usually inadvertent spiritual annihilation of these stewardships and responsibilities and callings and joys and salvations in his life. These attempts eventually abort in the face of the revelation of the phenomena of the stewardships of the constancy of self-subsistence in and through divine light.

The overthrow of the sin of pride, then, is not simply establishing a nihilistic creatureliness of personal existence simply contingent on divine being. Pride is not simply a movement toward annihilation of the divine by asserting the reality of the constancy of the self-subsistence of personal stewardship in personal existence. Pride is mistakenly presuming to have discovered and implemented the essential rhythms and attunements and appropriations in divine and human personal existence. The overthrow of pride is the healing accompanying the turn which discovers and implements these essential rhythms, attunements, and appropriations and leads to the appropriate gathering together in and through divine light of men and nations in justice, peace, and joy. This is the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah to turn and be healed (6:10) so that the whole world has rest and is at peace; it breaks into cries of joy (14:7).

Prophetic Sociology

Preclassical prophecy speaks continually of war, especially as a divine retribution consequent to the disobedience of peoples to divine commands and forewarnings. Classical prophecy adds the insight that war, especially the divine war, is the piercing of the pride of and the dismantling of the unfaithful city in preparation for and to the accomplishment of its appropriate reconstitution as a habitation of justice, peace, and joy. Postclassical prophecy seeks to uncover the essence of war and peace and of scattering and gathering to implement a further stage of advancement toward the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah. Toward this end several themes should be correlated and observed.

The deep concern of Isaiah over the scattering of Israel and Judah the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities is a sign of the scattering of human existence. This sign points not only to certain historical events in the Middle East in the eighth to sixth centuries B.C. but to dimensions of great significance in every dispensation of human existence, viz., its fallenness and its homelessness.

The rhythms of war and peace and scattering and gathering in the objective correlates of existence conceal the appropriate essential rhythms and attunements of personal existence. In this concealing men are fallen and homeless. Proximally, and for the most part, men in their fallenness, are fallen away from their destiny of being themselves in their own most appropriate ways. In this fallenness is a scattering. In this scattering is a being lost lost in the they. When and to the extent that persons are fallen away from the essential character of their destiny of most appropriately being themselves in the concealing of this destiny, they are absorbed in the they and are mastered by it (IV:210) in ways not most appropriate to the essential rhythms and attunements of their own personal existence.

The scattering of the fallenness of being lost in the they is made visible in certain definite phenomena

Isaiah says, inquire of the Lord while he is present, call upon him when he is close at hand (55:6). We are therefore in a delicate and complex circumstance. We may not legitimately attempt to make for ourselves a god by cunning and thus put aside by force this lack. Neither may we accommodate ourselves simply by calling on an accustomed god. But if the proximity we find ourselves in were not determined by this failure and hence Reserving, then the discovery could not be near in the way in which it is near. Without fear of godlessness we must remain near the Reserved and wait long enough in the prepared proximity of the failure until, out of the proximity, the divine dimension becomes clearer and clearer (1:265).

The Joyous has its being in the Serene (1:247). Joy is enjoying and, therefore, rejoicing (1:246). The deeper the grounding of Joy in enjoying, the greater the rejoicing. The Serene, the holy, is the origin of all that is joyous: it remains the Most Joyous. Here there occurs the pure serenification. Here in the highest dwells the high one, who is who he is, as having enjoyed the play of holy beams, the Joyous *One*. Personally, he seems inclined to create joy, with us. Since his essence is serenification, so he loves to open out and to illumine. Through the clear Serene he opens things out to that in their surroundings which causes joy. Through the joyful Serene he illumines the spirit of men so that their nature may be open to what is genuine in themselves and in their fields, towns, and houses (1:251-252). The opening up of the spirit of men to what is genuine in their nature and in their fields, towns, and houses through the illumination of the joyful Serene in the prophecy of Isaiah is the prophetic rejoicing over Jerusalem arising clothed in light; your light has come and the glory of the Lord shines over you (60:1). Then the whole world has rest and is at peace; it breaks into cries of joy (14:7).

The proximity of the Reserved has been recognized as the Serene and the serenification of life. Coming nearer yet and nearer, even though less evident than birches and mountains and therefore mostly overlooked and passed by, is the Serene itself, wherein both men and things now first appear (1:248). In greeting, angels bring to light the Serene in whose clarity the nature of men and things is safely preserved (1:249). The Serene preserves and holds everything in tranquility and wholeness. The Serene is fundamentally healing, hence the admonition of Isaiah to turn and be healed (6:10).

It is the holy (251). The Serene alone is able to house every thing in its proper place. The Serene allots each thing to that place of existence where by its nature it belongs (1:247). In this way is the gathering envisioned by Isaiah possible in which the nations shall march towards your light (60:3) and each man will go back to his own people, every one will flee to his own land (13:14).

Prophetic Anthropology

One of the most difficult matters of concern for postclassical prophecy is to show both the possibility and the desirability of the reconciliation of two aspects of existence long considered irreconcilable, viz., the reality of both divine and human self-subsistence. Many of the difficulties of preclassical and classical prophecy and the logical stages of postclassical prophecy are encountered precisely at this point. Without this reconciliation there is a strong tendency in human experience toward the alternatives either of various forms of overt or covert atheism and idolatry or of the many forms of the spiritual and physical annihilation of human existence, especially in the numerous aspects of human creatureliness and contingency so prominent in the human experience. All of this is tied somehow to the apparently great problem of human pride persisting throughout this experience. Such alarm has arisen over this problem that men have strongly tended to annihilate themselves and each other in rushing to their traditional creatureliness and contingency solutions.

The conception of the self-subsistence of man seems to lead inevitably to the quagmire of pride that Isaiah rightly envisioned as so destructive of the gathering of men and nations in and through divine light which is seen in Isaiah as so desirable. This misconception develops at times, paradoxically, from carrying commonsense impressions of the nature of personal existence (and its coming into being man is created [objectively] from nothing) too far into a very refined philosophical sophistication while at the same time overlooking or underestimating the significance of the phenomena of self-subsistence in personal existence which constantly show themselves. It develops from not envisioning phenomenologically in a more full and constant manner man's existential constitution. Ontologically, man is different from every non-personal object and reality (from everything that is present-at-hand or Real). His subsistence is not based on the substantiality of a substance but on the

Self-subsistence of the existing Self, whose being is care (IV:351). Connected frequently with this misconception is the impulse to systematization of the logic of logistics. This logic has developed such compulsion for only accepting as significant a point of thought within a fully developed and absolute system of thought that it represses phenomena showing themselves when incompatible with a particular closed system of thought. Postclassical prophecy, however, is superseding its roots at this point and sees as exceptionally significant the that it is of the phenomena of personal self-subsistence which constantly show themselves, even though the whence and the whither remain in darkness (IV:173) or are only seen through a glass darkly. The

Finally

the former troubles are forgotten
and they are hidden from my sight.

For behold, I create

new heavens and a new earth.

Rejoice and be filled with delight,

you boundless realms which I create;

for I create Jerusalem to be a delight

and her people a joy. [65:16-18]

CHAPTER 6 – Post-Classical Heideggerian and Post-Heideggerian Prophecy

Postclassical prophecy is concerned with an awareness of divine and human nature and relationships in their logical and metalogical (care) as well as their prelogical (preclassical) and protological dimensions. It is explanatory as well as proclamatory and poetic. Its orientation is much more ontological than is that of preclassical and classical prophecy. It is much more concerned with the meaning and significance and nature of individual personal life in its community setting than are the others.

The inspiration of preclassical and classical prophecy is Eros. The inspiration of postclassical prophecy is the interplay of Eros and Logos. The advantage of Logos is its explanatory spirit and preliminary spirit of inquiry and openness. Its disadvantage is its tendency to immodesty. Its passion for explanation often leads it to overlook Eros, to overgeneralize, to overemphasize two presumably full alternatives and pit them against one another as mutually exclusive categories in reaching conclusions, and to presume that it can and some times has made the final, conclusive, and totally adequate explanation. Consequently, its preliminary openness often closes and is stifled. It also tends toward too great a dualistic separation of the ideal and the real, i.e., metaphysics.

Logos leads to a search for truth and the nature of truth and a search for knowledge and the nature of knowledge and a search for being and the nature of being. It has gone too far in making the equation God is truth too dominant and thereby overlooking divine Eros and leading to an era of the death of the Logos god with its many definitional and conceptual difficulties, especially the problem of evil and the theories of creation *ex nihilo* and the depravity of man. Nevertheless, it brings to our attention the importance of continually attempting to identify more properly the nature of the divine as a prerequisite to overcoming idolatry and to identify more properly human nature as a prerequisite to overcoming the spiritual and physical annihilation of man.

As in Isaiah, a principal concern of postclassical prophecy is the scattering and gathering of men and nations. It seeks, however, beyond the preclassical and classical descriptions and proclamations of empire building and destroying through war and alliances and its political and social consequences, to discover the ontological bases for and the essence of scattering and gathering.

Man in preclassical prophecy is simply a creature devoted to serve and worship the Lord. When disobedient to this prescription, he is subject to being overtaken by calamity, especially war. Man in classical prophecy is both a creature of divine creation and, when albeit through much vicissitude he is properly gathered through and into divine light, he is a joyous nation rejoicing in the divine light and through it shining forth in his own light. As such, he finally dwells continually in peace and justice.

Only in postclassical prophecy does the question specifically develop What is man? (Psalm 8:4-8 only raises the question rhetorically in conjunction with the question of the son of man but without any attempt at an answer, and then only concludes with a brief proclamation of the extent of the dominion of the son of man. [Cf. Hebrews 2:5-10].) And only with the development of this question are there certain breakthroughs into understanding man's nature which are prerequisite to the bringing forth of the gathering of justice and peace and joy envisioned in Isaiah.

One of the beginning points of postclassical prophecy is the discovery that man is by nature noetic. Though Western thought has more and more confused logic (*logos, nous, phronesis, sophia*) with logistics (111:21; I:277-8, 356-7), we can nevertheless see more and more of the noetic and mnemonic nature of man through the history of Western noetic investigations. Though logic has gathered special knowledge concerning a special kind of thinking (111:21, IV:208-209), we can still see to some extent through it to the nature of thought and man as thinking.

An understanding of man recently discovered is instrumental in furthering the development of postclassical prophecy to a greater maturity. Western logistics has so emphasized the nature of man as a rational being endowed with the special kind of thinking it has developed that it has so far, for the most part, overlooked this recent discovery. This discovery points out that man is Care. Man is already ahead of himself in each case; this is implied in his state-of-being as care. Man is an entity for which, in his being, his ownmost potentiality-for-being is an issue (IV:270). Man's transformation into that which he can be in being-free for his ownmost possibilities (projection) is accomplished in care. With equal primordially, care determines what is basically specific in each man (IV:243). Care is resolute. Care is that in which persons can and do become open and bright and clear, in and for themselves and each other. Care is that in which it is possible for persons to have factual attitudes and be in factual situations of willing and wishing, urge and addiction, concern and solicitude, possibilities and potentialities, circumspective deliberation, the call of conscience, the possibility of being-guilty, resolute anticipation of ends, understanding, states of mind, and discourse with each other. All of these

attitudes and situations presuppose care. It is a common denominator of existence from which all spring and take their character. Each is of the nature of care and suggests its nature and participates in its nature. Conscience, for example, manifests itself as the call of care (IV:322). The call of conscience has its ontological possibilities in the fact that man, in the very basis of his being, is care (IV:322-323). Being-guilty is presupposed by the call of conscience, which is presupposed by care. Being-guilty is what provides, above all, the ontological condition for man's ability to come to owe anything in factically existing. This essential being-guilty is equiprimordially the existential condition for the possibility of the morally good and for the morally evil—that is, for morality in general (IV:332).

To go beyond logic as logistics in more adequately discovering the nature of man, the broader nature of man as noetic and as care should be taken together. In so doing we begin to discover the ontological basis of gathering and the gathering of men together in justice, peace, and joy.

Man is the being who is insofar as he thinks, thinks in that thought appeals to him because his essential nature includes memory (*mnemosyne*), the gathering of thought (111:31). Memory here does not mean just any thought of anything that can be thought. Memory (*mnemosyne*) is the gathering and convergence of thought to essentials, to what everywhere demands to be thought about first of all. Memory (*mnemosyne*) is the gathering of recollection, thinking back. It safely keeps everything that essentially is (III:11). Safety is saving properly: which is salvation; which presupposes gathering properly; which presupposes proper thought and mnemonics; which presupposes care. Thinking is thinking the essence of... Thinking is the gathering together which makes present what is (111:68). An overtone of this thinking is thanking. This thinking always involves, and in that sense is thanking. The *thanc*, the heart's core, is the gathering of all that concerns us, all that we care for, all that touches us insofar as we are, as human beings. It is concentrated, gathered *toward* us beforehand. In a certain manner, then, though not exclusively, we ourselves are that gathering (111:144). The gathering of what is next to us here never means an after-the-fact collection of things or persons or of what basically exists, but the tidings that overtake all our doings, the tidings of what we are and thus of what we are committed to beforehand by being ourselves and being human beings (III:144-145).

Another discovery regarding the nature of man is significant in gathering men together appropriately. Though in some sense men as men are all alike, yet it is also the case that in some sense all men are not equal, that not everybody has aptitude and claim to everything (111:69). The essential gathering together, then, of men and nations is complicated by the need to allow for and account for the individual essential differences between men as well as their similarities. This can only come about as essence-seeing eyes are developed (I:293).

In this connection, still other discoveries are significant. Human existence, both individually and collectively, involves essential rhythms (I:317) and attunements (IV:172-3) and appropriations (II:19-24). Each person is essentially both his own most appropriate rhythm and attunement, and essentially is in a most appropriate rhythm and attunement with others. Proper gathering of scattered man is predicated upon a sensitivity to and the most appropriate discovery of these essential rhythms and attunements, that is, being-in-tune with personal reality both individually and collectively.

Prophetic Theology

A theological vocation of postclassical prophecy is an introduction to and guarding of a modesty through which the divine element of preclassical and classical prophecy is more adequately understood, and through which the death of the Logos god is placed in a perspective in which it implements increased recognition of the divine dimensions of existence.

From the perspective of postclassical prophecy, the proclamations of both preclassical and classical prophecy against idolatry are too simple. Only in postclassical prophecy does the question develop, Can man as mortal man ever experience and understand all that the divine is? And only with the development of this question does the realization come that either he cannot or that such experience and understanding would be so rare that it would not be generally applicable to man's relationship to and understanding of the divine.

Idolatry as some lack of experience and understanding of the divine, with its likely accompanying distortion of understanding, is common to all men since human existence always embodies lacking, though not an absolute nullity but rather embodies something present which lacks something. This lack of full understanding of the divine is named the not yet now (II:11). The complete uncovering (revelation) of the divine is Reserved. That which is already given and is yet at the same time being withheld is the Reserved (I:245); or as Isaiah says, I am your God (43:5); I am with you (41:10); Let the peoples come to meet me (41:1). The Reserved is approaching but still remains sought after. Why? Because they are not yet ready for it (I:245). To grasp him much, our joy is scarcely large enough (I:263). We are still in a time of the Reserved in which we lack the full appearance and appropriation of the divine. Nevertheless, the divine, in being Reserved, is at the same time near (I:264-265); as